

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 141 610

08

CE 011 813

AUTHOR Goldstein, Michael B.
TITLE The Current State of Career Education at the Postsecondary Level.
INSTITUTION National Advisory Council for Career Education, Washington, D.C.; Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Jun 77
NOTE 121p.
AVAILABLE FROM Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402 (Stock Number 017-080-01734-2)

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.83 HC-\$6.01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Agency Role; Attitudes; *Career Education; Colleges; Educational Administration; Educational Objectives; Educational Practice; Educational Research; Educational Trends; *Federal Programs; Government Role; Higher Education; National Surveys; *Policy Formation; *Post Secondary Education; Universities; Work Experience Programs

ABSTRACT

Prepared for the National Advisory Council for Career Education, this report of a study on the current state of career education at the postsecondary level provides an overview of how American colleges and universities perceive and practice career education, together with a set of recommendations for action to encourage and facilitate the adoption and implementation of this concept. The report contains an aggregation of interview responses elicited from institutional officers, faculty, administrators, and students from a cross-section of colleges and universities including public and private schools; 2-year, 4-year, and graduate institutions; and those representing various purposes, sizes, and geographical areas. Based on the study, 14 findings are outlined and discussed; 10 recommendations are made for what the Office of Career Education in particular and the Federal government in general can do to encourage and facilitate the acceptance and adoption of career education. Career education in the context of higher education, and career education perceptions and practices are discussed in detail. An exemplary list of Federal programs with the potential for providing support to the development and implementation of the career education concept at the postsecondary level is provided. (TA)

* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort. *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *

ED141610

THE CURRENT STATE OF CAREER EDUCATION
AT THE POSTSECONDARY LEVEL

Prepared for the
National Advisory Council for Career Education

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN-
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT
OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

By

Michael B. Goldstein
Associate Vice Chancellor
for Urban and Governmental Affairs
University of Illinois at Chicago Circle
Chicago, Illinois

0E011 8/3

PREFACE

A considerable portion of each agenda of the National Advisory Council for Career Education is devoted to assessing the various means by which the identifiable knowledge gaps in career education can be closed. The result has been the commissioning of two series of papers on a wide variety of topics. Several of the papers from the first series were published in 1976, e.g., those dealing with the emerging history and the efficacy of career education.

A second series of papers were commissioned in 1976, again, on a broad number of career education concerns. The document in your hands is one of those submitted to the Council in either late 1976 and early 1977.

At the April 6, 1977 meeting of the Council, a substantial amount of time was spent discussing these papers. A motion was passed unanimously to reflect the position to which the Council strongly adheres, namely, that it is healthy to have different points of view on career education and that the promotion of these differing views is a very positive step in the life of career education. We sincerely believe that the dissemination of these papers is, indeed, a very salutary action in the furtherance of the career education debate.

This does not and should not imply that the National Advisory Council for Career Education accepts and endorses all the concepts, ideas, suggestions and recommendations in the papers we are now disseminating. We disagree with opinions expressed in several of these papers. This document, rather, reflects the realization that the Council has identified certain goals and issues and that we wish to make available for reading, and, to be sure, thought-provoking discussion, this set of commissioned papers which directly explore these goals and issues.

Our intent, as we have indicated, has been to close some of the existing knowledge and philosophical gaps in the field. We trust this document will contribute toward that end.

George F. Meyer, Jr.
Chairperson

May 20, 1977

This report is published under provisions of Public Law 93-380, Section 406 of the Education Amendments of 1974.

The opinions expressed in this report do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the U.S. Office of Education, and no official endorsement by the U.S. Office of Education should be inferred.

National Advisory Council for Career Education, June 1977

PREFACE

This is the report of a study on the current state of career education at the postsecondary level, prepared for the National Advisory Council on Career Education and the Office of Career Education, U.S. Office of Education, under Contract P00760298.

The report provides an overview of how American colleges and universities perceive and practice career education, together with a set of recommendations for action to encourage and facilitate the adoption and implementation of this concept at the postsecondary level.

Appreciation should be expressed to the many faculty, administrators, staff and students at institutions across the country who gave so freely of their time to provide the information upon which this report is based. Special thanks must be extended to David Cullings of Cornell University and Gideon Stanton of Tulane University for their assistance and advice, to my able research assistant, Robert Rooney, a graduate student in the Urban Planning and Policy Program, College of Urban Sciences, University of Illinois at Chicago Circle, for his dedicated service, and to my spouse, Jinny M. Goldstein, whose expertise in her own areas of academic administration aided me in this effort, as did her perceptive editorial suggestions.

MICHAEL B. GOLDSTEIN
Chicago, Illinois
December, 1976

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION AND SCOPE OF STUDY.	1
FINDINGS	.11
RECOMMENDATIONS	.19
CAREER EDUCATION IN THE CONTEXT OF HIGHER EDUCATION	.26
CAREER EDUCATION: PERCEPTIONS	.37
CAREER EDUCATION: PRACTICES	.65
EXEMPLARY LIST OF FEDERAL PROGRAMS WITH THE POTENTIAL FOR PROVIDING SUPPORT TO THE DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CAREER EDUCATION CONCEPT AT THE POSTSECONDARY LEVEL	109
NOTES	114

INTRODUCTION AND SCOPE OF STUDY

Career education, as a coherent and formally articulated concept, is a relative newcomer to the American education scene. The Office of Career Education within the U.S. Office of Education has adopted 1971, during the tenure of Dr. Sidney P. Marland as Commissioner of Education, as the watershed date for the launching of what has become known as "The Career Education Concept".

The earliest expressions of the career education concept were phrased in terms that were most amenable to elementary and secondary school systems. Indeed, the Office of Career Education can point with considerable pride to the adoption of major elements of this concept in a majority of American school districts, as well as among virtually all state education agencies and within the business and labor communities.

The recent Commissioner's National Conference on Career Education in Houston symbolized the penetration and appeal of this concept, as it brought together several thousand delegates from throughout the country. Career education, as a component of elementary and secondary education, is clearly no longer a voice in the wilderness.

But this is a study of career education at the post-secondary level: What has been achieved in elementary and secondary schools is very different indeed from the situation among American colleges and universities. Thus, it is well to

look at a profile of the attendees at the National Conference, as well as at the conference program.¹ The overwhelming majority of registrants from educational institutions represented local elementary and secondary schools and districts, coming particularly from among the ranks of school guidance personnel. Representatives of higher education institutions were few and far between, and college and university faculty (with the possible exception of those involved in teacher education) were virtually non-existent.

The configuration of the conference program itself reflected both the audience and the current status of career education within the American educational system. Of the roughly four hundred topic sessions, only twenty-nine could be considered at all related to career education in colleges and universities. Of these twenty-nine (representing seven percent of the time allocated for topic sessions) more than a third (eleven) related to the training of elementary and secondary teachers and counsellors by colleges of education, and another quarter (seven) concerned programs exclusively at community and junior colleges. Thus, only eleven out of four hundred hours of sessions at the National Conference on Career Education were devoted to the interests of four-year colleges and universities, a meager 2.75%. And none of the general sessions dealt with career education at institutions of higher education as a major element, although to be sure several speakers, Dr. Marland among them, took pains to mention

the need for development in this area.

These comments are in no way meant to denigrate the enormous value of the National Conference in promoting the career education concept, nor the care and skill evidenced in its conduct. But in a very real sense the conference served as a barometer of the state of career education, and the career education concept, at the postsecondary level. It is very much a minority element, without anything approaching the level or breadth of visible support that it has been able to engender at the elementary and secondary levels.

The general impression created at the National Conference is indeed consistent with the analysis of the results of this study. While there are certainly quite a few institutions that have enthusiastically embraced the concept of career education, they are but a handful among the thousands in the nation. For every institution that has adopted career education as a component of its program, there are many more whose faculties and administrators have, either explicitly or implicitly, shied away from the concept and particularly from its rhetoric. Thus, to many faculty and administrators at colleges and universities the career education concept is regarded as something for the elementary and secondary schools, and perhaps even for community or junior colleges (although there is resistance even there), but certainly not to be adopted on their own campuses. Indeed, the term "Career Education" is regarded by many academics as perjorative, representing an

attempt to displace the basic tenets of higher education with a system of vocational training.

That this view is not consistent with the reality of the career education concept is not material. What is important is that a significant number of persons in positions of prestige and authority within higher education have either accepted it or are not willing to debate the point with those of their colleagues who are of such a persuasion. One ought not be mislead into assuming that career education is regarded as a benign concept whose potential has simply not been fully realized at the postsecondary level. Rather, an analysis of the current state of career education among American colleges and universities, and particularly any efforts aimed at improving its acceptance and penetration, must recognize and deal with the negative feelings the concept has engendered within a relatively brief period of time.

To further complicate the matter, while the formally articulated career education concept is regarded as anathema by many faculty and administrators, its component elements have been adopted and implemented with considerable alacrity throughout higher education. Thus, while an institution and its staff may cling to the belief that career education has no place on their campus, it is likely to be actively engaged in delivering just the package of services and activities which the concept subsumes. This apparent contradiction -- rejecting the concept while embracing the practice -- must be

recognized and dealt with if career education is indeed to realize its potential as an integral component of the American system of higher education.

Although the Office of Career Education has made it clear that it views the career education concept as more than simply the sum of a set of discrete activities, nonetheless for the purpose of this study it is necessary to deal with specifically identifiable elements. From the current literature, and particularly relying on Hoyt's monograph on the ideal postsecondary model for career education,² the following set of elements emerge:

- Career information, guidance and placement services.
- Development of faculty expertise in and commitment to work-education interactions (commonly referred to as faculty development).
- Curriculum development to reflect career education interests and needs.
- Involvement of the business-labor-industry-governmental communities in the learning process.
- Opportunities for the integration of the worlds of learning and work through non-campus based experiences (commonly referred to as work-learning).

This study is intended to provide an insight into how career education is perceived at the postsecondary level, how in reality it is accepted and practiced, and what the Office of Career Education in particular and the Federal government in general ought to do to encourage and facilitate its acceptance and adoption. The study does not, however, represent an attempt to catalogue career education programs at postsecondary institutions, nor is it intended as a description of exemplary programs. Indeed, for the purposes of this study exemplary programs have intentionally been excluded, for the specific reason that they tend not to be reflective of the normative state of the field. There have always been institutions of higher education that have prided themselves upon being innovative, of challenging the frontiers of academia. That some of these have embraced the career education concept proves only that this is possible within the context of such an institution.

Exemplary programs indeed do need to be catalogued and analyzed with great care, for they are the testing grounds for the operational elements of the concept. But they ought not lull the proponents of career education into a false sense of security; that if a few institutions adopt the concept can the rest be far behind. The history of American higher education tells us that they often can, with the innovators often remaining far out front with little evidence that the great bulk of institutions have any interest in following their lead.

Indeed, the presence of the innovative few seems to serve as a pressure relief for the majority: If a student or faculty member really wants a career education-oriented institution, they are to be found. So why, some faculty and administrators reason, need we change our own?

The study was carried out among a cross-section of colleges and universities, including public and private institutions, two-year, four-year and graduate institutions, those whose primary emphasis is upon teaching and those who pride themselves upon their scholarly research prowess, institutions of vast internal diversity and those with very narrow purposes, and, finally, institutions representing various geographic sections of the country. While no attempt was made to achieve a perfect profile of American higher education, it is believed that the sample represents a reasonable cross-section of interests, purposes and institutional styles.

In addition to examining a cross-section of institutions, care was taken to insure that the study would not be skewed by the views of one specific level or category of institutional personnel. The analysis of the status of career education at a particular institution generally involved discussions with a variety of administrators, faculty, staff and students, including chief academic officers, heads of academic units, faculty involved in some aspect of career education, counseling and guidance personnel and non-academic program

directors. The perceptions of these individuals regarding the attitudes and biases of others within their institutions has been extremely useful in determining the appropriate entry and action points. Often, for example, persons at several levels all voiced support for career education, but pointed to the others as stymying its acceptance.

It is important to understand the initial hypothesis that was used in establishing the parameters of this study. Since a cataloguing of all career education activities at the postsecondary level was not either feasible or indeed desirable, and since a study of exemplary programs was to be undertaken by another investigator contemporaneously with this effort, it was determined to approach this analysis by keying on a specific element of career education: work-learning. The selection of work-learning for this purpose was determined by the relative ease through which its presence could be identified within an institution and the wide variety of configurations that it has achieved among different types of institutions and settings. It was hypothesized that by tracking the development and implementation of work-learning programs and related activities within an appropriate sample of institutions, it would be possible to obtain a useful profile of the general status of career education at those institutions and, importantly, to identify those issues and factors that either facilitate or retard the adoption of the concept and its component elements.

The study was conducted in two phases. First, a selected group of institutional officers and faculty were interviewed regarding their general views on the subject of career education, its status within their own institutions, and the elements of that concept that appeared either to be in place or most likely to be amenable to adoption. Emphasis was placed upon the component elements of career education that related directly to the academic process. The results of these discussions were then reduced to a set of preliminary statements that set forth the fundamental perceptions of the interviewees. These statements were then reviewed by a much larger cohort of faculty, administrators and students in an open-ended discussion format, seeking to elicit their views as to where the career education concept was headed in the context of their own institution as well as how the specific component elements were viewed and practiced. Aside from general administrators, persons involved in work-learning activities were identified to provide appropriate entry points for academic discussions.

This report contains an aggregation of the responses elicited from among the many persons interviewed during the course of the study. Because the statements were often related to matters of internal policy and administration, not to mention individual styles and attitudes, all subjects were assured of the confidentiality of their remarks. Comments are therefore cited only with enough specificity to enable the

reader to comprehend their context from both the perspective of the role of the speaker within the context of his or her institution and the nature of that institution, where such information is relevant. Any attempt to statistically analyze the responses would result in misleading information; therefore the author must take full responsibility for synthesizing the considerable mass of material gathered through this study into a coherent set of analyses, findings and recommendations.

There is no gainsaying the complexity of the issues involved, nor the difficulties inherent in achieving the level of acceptance of the concept of career education that is sought by the National Advisory Council. This study seeks not only to report on current status and perceptions, but to recommend approaches that will serve to encourage the adoption of those component elements of the career education concept as are most amenable to the various forms and levels of American higher education. The underlying premise, strongly reflected in the views of those interviewed, is that it is only through the acceptance of the functional activities subsumed within the career education concept that the theory which surrounds them can gain general acceptance. It is hoped that this study will be seen as an outline of the strategies that need be considered to render career education a viable and valued characteristic of our system of higher education.

FINDINGS

- I. Career education as a concept has not significantly penetrated American higher education.
 - A. The term "career education" is either not understood or is considered alien by a majority of faculty and academic administrators.
 - B. The career education concept, as it has been formally stated, is not generally considered appropriate for institutions of higher education except in very specialized cases.
 - C. Affirmative rejection of the career education concept is generally viewed as unnecessary; faculty and administrators are more likely to simply ignore it entirely.
- II. Negative reaction to the career education concept is the result of a combination of factors.
 - A. The concept is viewed as derivative of elementary and secondary education and as such is perceived as designed to serve those interests.
 - B. The concept is expressed in terms that are not generally viewed as appropriate to higher education.
 - C. Rather than originating from within the framework of higher education the concept has been promoted directly and strenuously by external forces, particularly the federal government.

II. (continued)

- D. The arguments supporting the concept have often been conflicting and shrill, presenting the appearance of an educational fad rather than a serious pedagogical development.
- E. The concept has been promoted as having been generated out of mass public opinion rather than through the development of logical and systematic academic theory.

III. The career education concept has not been viewed as adaptable to the structural, pedagogical and philosophical premises of higher education.

- A. Little attention has been paid to the enormous structural and contextual differences between elementary and secondary education on the one hand and postsecondary education on the other.
- B. These differences are so significant as to make it appear logical to reject the concept on the ground of general inapplicability without ever dealing with its substance.

IV. As it is understood by most members of the higher education community, the career education concept relates substantially to areas within the domain of student support services, rather than to the mainstream of institutional academic programming.

IV. (continued)

- A. In times of budgetary stringency such support services are considered of lower priority, particularly insofar as their access to new or reallocated resources.
- B. Pressure for adoption of the career education concept is seen as a way to channel resources into these lower priority areas, away from basic research and instructional needs.

V. There is little evidence that mainstream postsecondary institutions are willing to embrace the articulated career education concept.

- A. The fact that demonstration and exemplary career education projects may be implemented through categorical grants and contracts does not necessarily indicate a willingness on the part of most institutions to accept and adopt the career education concept absent similar direct economic incentives.
- B. Short term funding designed to stimulate adoption of the career education concept (or indeed any new approach) is increasingly viewed as antithetical to the interests of the institution; the availability of ongoing, baseline support is increasingly considered a precondition for the institutionalization of new program concepts.

VI. The career education concept is not an irreducible whole but rather consists of a set of component elements.

A. The presence of the sum of these component elements should by definition result in the implementation of a complete career education program.

B. These component elements are based upon specific activities that are amenable to examination, evaluation and implementation.

VII. When examined from the perspective of the presence and performance of these elements, penetration of career education at the postsecondary level is relatively significant.

A. This result is substantially independent of the size, academic orientation or programmatic emphasis of the institution.

B. The strongest and most viable component elements are those that are perceived as part of or directly supporting the academic program of the institution, rather than viewed as serving the needs of students independent of the academic program.

VII. (continued)

- C. Despite the fact that an academic unit may be carrying out one or more of the component elements of the career education concept there is a substantial reluctance to accept either the language of career education or even to acknowledge that such activities are in fact related to career education.

VIII. Development of career education as a generally accepted component of higher education requires the reorientation of present faculty and administrators and the development of appropriate interest and sensitivity among the next generation of faculty.

- A. The component elements of career education, and thus the concept itself, must be presented in a form that will generate incentives for substantial faculty involvement.

IX. Acceptance of career education at the postsecondary level therefore requires that emphasis be placed upon the component elements of that concept that are most academically credible, as opposed to those that appear to be vocational or oriented towards student services.

- A. *CURRICULUM AND FACULTY DEVELOPMENT*, while both strictly academic efforts, tend to be driven by other forces and must therefore be stimulated by institutionally-perceived need.

IX. (continued)

- B. *CAREER INFORMATION, GUIDANCE AND PLACEMENT* are ancillary student support services, even when delivered within an academic unit.
 - C. *INVOLVEMENT OF BUSINESS-LABOR-INDUSTRY-GOVERNMENTAL CONSTITUENCIES* is generally the result of extrinsic forces that make such utilization appropriate and attractive.
 - D. *WORK-LEARNING* is in itself often viewed as a pedagogical device appropriate to the instructional (academic) system in a relatively wide variety of settings and curricula.
- X. Effective work-learning programs require the ultimate development of all of the other component elements that together comprise the career education concept.
- A. These elements, when related to specific work-learning activities rather than to the abstract concept of career education, tend to become more attractive and valuable to the institution.
 - B. The allocation of resources to support these activities becomes more viable based upon the benefits they are perceived as providing to the academic program of the institution.

XI. Work-learning programs have not generally achieved the necessary level of institutional visibility and prominence required to trigger the adoption of the remaining component elements of the career education concept.

- A. Most work-learning programs operate at or below the departmental level.
- B. The result of such fragmentation is that the opportunity for developing a coherent and suitably supported work-learning program is diminished, and with it the opportunity to create a climate hospitable to the larger career education concept.
- C. However, work-learning programs based within academic departments and colleges may be more closely atuned to the needs and priorities of the students and faculty of those units then might be the case for a program administered from a campus-wide perspective.

XII. Work-learning activities are increasingly laying claim to academically-derived resources, increasing likelihood for stable funding support.

- A. Career education components developed within the context of institutional work-learning programs tend to share the institutionalization achieved by the latter.

XIII. Campus-wide coordination and facilitation of work-learning activities tend to provide a range of support services that incorporate career education elements.

- A. The most effective campus-wide entities are organized so as to straddle the line between academic programming and student support services.
- B. Rather than actually operating work-learning programs, such campus-wide entities tend to support the efforts of the several campus academic units.
- C. Resources acquired through the development of the campus-wide center tend to become available for the support of a wider range of career education activities.

XIV. The key to a successful work-learning and career education program is the close and willing involvement of the teaching faculty.

- A. Involvement of faculty in such activities is based on internal values and interests, rather than external pressure.
- B. Effective campus-wide work-learning centers stimulate this self-interest among the faculty.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- I. The career education concept should be pursued and promoted in a manner consistent with the context and priorities of higher education.
 - A. Approaches that have proven effective at the elementary and secondary levels should be reviewed in the light of their applicability to and acceptance by institutions of higher education.
 - B. College and university administrators, faculty, staff and students should be afforded the opportunity to reflect upon and influence the development of the career education concept at the post-secondary level. Advocates of career education should demonstrate openness to institutional alternatives.
 - C. Arguments based upon public sentiment should be replaced with substantive evidence of the benefits of career education to institutions of higher education and to their clienteles.
 - D. Adversary strategies should be avoided; the contention that those who fail to embrace the career education concept will ultimately be pushed aside should be discarded.
 - E. Direct government advocacy of the formal career education concept should be minimized.

II. To reach the maximum postsecondary audience, the career education concept should be formulated in terms of its positive implications for academic programming and services.

- A. The centrality of the career education concept to the general theories of higher education should be emphasized.
- B. Care should be taken to avoid assignment of career education solely to the domain of student services.

III. Career education should be promoted through its component elements as they most directly impact upon the academic program of postsecondary institutions.

- A. The specific component elements that together constitute the career education concept should be carefully and distinctly defined, including their interrelationships and the ways they may interact with an institution's existing academic programming and support services.
- B. Institutions should be encouraged to perceive the adoption of elements of the career education concept as positive steps towards the realization of a coherent career education program.
- C. Each component element should be examined in the context of its relevance to specific institutional settings and configurations.

IV. Initial support should be focused on work-learning as the component element of career education that is most closely related to the institutional academic program.

- A. Institutions should be encouraged to develop work-learning programs as part of a coordinated approach aimed at the implementation of a career education system.
- B. The development and enhancement of work-learning programs should not, however, be conditioned upon initial institutional acceptance of the entire career education concept.

V. Resources should be made available to stimulate the development of campus-wide capabilities to encourage, support and facilitate work-learning and related career education elements.

- A. Such campus-wide systems should be encouraged to provide operational linkages between the instructional program of the institution and its support services areas.
- B. Institutional autonomy of action and opportunity for innovation should be preserved; models should be exemplary rather than mandated.

VI. Resources should be identified to support the development and implementation of appropriate career education activities.

- A. Existing federal programs of institutional and student support should be examined to determine their potential for supporting the component elements of career education. (*An exemplary list of such programs will be found in the Appendix to this study.*)
1. The Office of Career Education should convene a Task Force to study these programs and arrive at specific proposals for amendments to statutes, regulations, guidelines or grant support criteria to permit maximum utilization of existing resources for the purpose of facilitating the development and implementation of career education activities.
 2. Information on the relationship of the available federal programs to support work-learning and the other component elements of career education should be widely and thoroughly disseminated.
- B. New resources should be developed to support those activities that cannot be financed through existing programs, and to provide for incremental growth as the career education concept achieves general acceptance at the postsecondary level.

VI. (continued)

1. Such support should be developed in a form that will enable the institutions to view it as ongoing rather than short term.
2. Catalytic support should be utilized only as part of an overall strategy that includes vehicles or reasonable incentives for the continuing support of career education activities at the end of the demonstration period.
 - a. The policy requiring institutions to assure that they will finance an activity upon termination of catalytic support is counter-productive and should be avoided.

VII. The Office of Career Education should encourage institutions to identify and make use of available sources of support for the development and implementation of career education activities.

- A. The Office of Career Education should provide technical assistance to institutions, either directly or through regional service centers, to enable them to effectively utilize available resources to develop and implement coherent career education programs that are consistent with institutional needs and priorities.

VIII. The Office of Career Education should establish an advisory committee to deal exclusively with the needs and interests of postsecondary education.

- A. The committee should be charged with communicating to the Office of Career Education the views and concerns of their constituencies regarding the concept, components and practices of career education, as well as providing a vehicle to convey to the wide variety of postsecondary institutions a better understanding of the career education concept.
- B. The advisory committee should serve within the framework of the National Advisory Council on Career Education, but should be clearly reflective of the interests and characteristics of postsecondary institutions.
- C. Membership on the advisory committee should include persons from the following categories:
 - 1. Institutional type -- graduate; research oriented; four-year liberal arts; four-year teacher training or specialized; two-year community; proprietary. Should include mix of public and private institutions.
 - 2. Personnel type -- chief executive officer; chief academic officer; dean or department head (should include mix of humanities, social and natural sciences, professions, etc.);

VIII. (continued)

faculty (same mix criteria); counseling and guidance officer; work-learning program administrator; students.

IX. The National Institute of Education should support further research into the implications of career education on the development of academic curricula, student recruitment and retention, and career success.

A. Particular attention should be placed upon the changing nature of postsecondary education through the year 2000 and the potential areas of interface between career education and traditional academic concepts.

X. The Fund for the Advancement of Postsecondary Education should support further innovation in career education programming and delivery.

A. Special emphasis should be placed on the development of exemplary programs within traditional academic frameworks.

CAREER EDUCATION IN THE CONTEXT OF
HIGHER EDUCATION

The first step in an analysis of the status of career education at the postsecondary level must involve a review of the substantial contextual differences between the structure and organization of American colleges and universities on the one hand and our systems of elementary and secondary schools on the other, for it is in part as a result of these differences that the career education concept has been so willingly adopted in the case of the latter and yet so tentatively embraced among the former.

There are several distinctions between the two levels of education which significantly impact upon their acceptance of any new concept. Elementary and secondary schools are, by and large, organized along strict hierarchical lines. With a variety of intermediate steps depending upon local circumstances and the size and complexity of the system, classroom teachers report to principals who report to superintendants who are accountable to a local elected or appointed board. Educational policy is set by the superintendant with the approval of the board and implemented down through the hierarchy. Once the board and superintendant determine that emphasis is to be placed upon a specific approach, such as career education, resources are allocated and personnel detailed to carry out the necessary functions. To be sure, there are many possible complications, not the least of which

are resource limitations and collective bargaining agreements, but the key elements, those of hierarchical accountability and decision making, remain basic to the system.

The organizational structure of colleges and universities could not be more different. There is of course a clearly defined formal hierarchy, beginning with the individual faculty member and rising through department head, dean, chief academic officer, president and governing board. But there is a second, parallel hierarchy, organized along disciplinary lines, which in the context of academic decision making is often more important. And many actions avoid the hierarchy entirely, left by policy or tradition to the discretion of the individual scholar/teacher.

Educational policy, at least insofar as it concerns curriculum and the nature of the specific academic program, is determined substantially by the faculty, particularly the more senior, tenured members. The department head, dean or even president may seek to encourage a particular thrust or development, but few have the temerity to attempt to instruct the faculty as to what they shall teach, or, even less likely, how they shall do so. The "proper" role of academic administrators (from department heads on up) is seen as obtaining the resources necessary to carry out the academic programs that are determined by the faculty. Of course, there is a great deal a president, dean or department head can do to influence the academic judgments of his or her faculty, but

the operative term is "influence", rather than "direct", as is very much the case at the elementary and secondary levels.

The differences between the roles of a local school board and a college or university board of trustees are likewise significant. A local school board may be "sold" on a new concept, either by its own superintendant or by outside forces, most notably public sentiment. Thus, the several public opinion polls which have shown work relevance to be of great importance to most people can have a significant effect on the response of a school board to the implementation of a career education program, particularly since those same school board members are most often directly accountable to the public within their own community.

College and university governing boards are, however, quite different entities. First and foremost, it is considered improper for a governing board to involve itself directly in educational policy matters. While such bodies are often required to formally determine academic policy, such as the authorizing of a new degree offering or the establishment of an academic unit, and while technically most boards appoint, promote and tenure faculty and administrators, to a very great extent they act only upon the recommendation of the faculty and the administration. Indeed, a board acts very much at its own peril if it seeks to overstep these bounds. The fact, therefore, that the public may think career education is an outstanding idea may have little effect on a college governing

board unless that interest is matched by a critical level of faculty support for the concept.

It is also important to recognize that college and university governing boards are usually appointed, and generally composed of men and women of achievement, prestige and/or wealth. They are therefore rather more immune from the sorts of public pressures that local school boards are often so quick to feel.

A further important distinction lies in the manner of the hiring of new teaching staff. At the elementary and secondary levels, such decisions are made administratively, so that if the system seeks teachers with an interest in or experience with career education, it goes on the marketplace to recruit them (although again with a variety of limitations, particularly in the collective bargaining arena). In colleges and universities, however, hiring decisions are collegial, with the faculty playing a substantial role in the determination as to who should be hired and, perhaps more important, who should be promoted and granted tenure. Faculties tend to recruit and promote in their own images; it is extremely difficult, for example, to recruit, promote and tenure a faculty member whose primary interest is career development when the faculty of the department or college tends to be interested only in a person's scholarly achievements. To a substantial degree, administrators are helpless in the face of faculty resistance to the hiring and retention

of non-conforming faculty. Again, it is a question of persuasion and the holding out of rewards, rather than a clear case of administrative prerogative.

This distinction is blurred, to be sure, with regard to student services personnel. In the case of guidance and counseling staff, institutions of higher education seem to be able to hire and retain persons whose skills and interests may embrace new approaches and concepts. But it is clear that notwithstanding the considerable importance of such supportive services personnel in the implementation of an effective career education program, the initiation of such an effort and its continuance as an integral part of the institution's program mandates the close and continued involvement of a critical proportion of the teaching faculty.

The academic apprenticeship system -- graduate teaching and research assistants -- is also very different from the training process afforded elementary and secondary school teachers. In the latter case, colleges of education provide training in accordance with the specifications generally established by state and local teacher certification authorities (as well as the national accrediting organization); the teacher-in-training undergoes his or her student teaching assignment in a school setting outside of the college campus.

The university graduate student who aspires to become a college professor apprentices within his or her own department, taking on the mores and values of the present faculty, parti-

cularly the more senior members who are most likely to have the benefit of ample graduate student assistance. The opportunity to be exposed to innovative programming may be diminished and indeed the student may have instilled in him or her the belief that the true purpose of the faculty is to perform scholarly research; that teaching and service are necessary but clearly tangential activities. With such values impressed at the apprentice stage, it is no wonder that faculty members tend to view scholarly pursuits as the highest endeavor, therefore placing rather less emphasis on teaching and student services.

Once the graduate student earns his or her credentials and is fortunate enough to obtain a position with a college or university, additional pressures are brought to play which continue to militate against involvement in innovative, non-scholarly activities. The junior faculty member is usually faced with a combination of heavy teaching load and the expectation that he or she will produce a certain quantity of scholarly research and publications, upon which decisions of promotion and tenure will ultimately be made. To a substantial degree, those decisions are made by the senior faculty of the department within which the junior member is working. It is their priorities and standards to which he or she must conform. If they do not include such activities as career development, student interaction and the like, then the young assistant professor would be well advised to avoid these areas

and concentrate on what is needed to insure the next promotional step and ultimately the protection of tenure.

Indeed, one discussant, himself a senior member of the faculty of a major university, remarked that his interest in career development and experiential learning arose only after he achieved tenure and the rank of full professor. He could afford, at this juncture of his career, to be as innovative and, in a sense, iconoclastic, as he desired. His colleagues might look upon him as an oddity, but his status was now immune from their scrutiny.

Certainly senior faculty are a welcome and needed addition to the ranks of those involved in the promotion of career education and its related activities. But what a pity that the internal system tends to force more junior men and women to sublimate that interest so long as they remain professionally vulnerable.

Finally, there is the question of where persons likely to be involved in career education fit within the hierarchies of their respective institutions. The formal and essentially unitary hierarchical structures of elementary and secondary schools tend to minimize the distinctions between teaching and counseling personnel. While counseling and guidance is a distinct curriculum area in the training of elementary and secondary schools personnel, nonetheless there is little evidence of significant status distinctions between classroom teachers and student services teachers. Indeed, in many

systems it is a promotional step to have acquired the requisite credits for certification as a guidance counsellor and to be assigned to non-classroom activities. Peer group interaction is therefore strong, and there is considerable opportunity for persons committed to innovative ideas, such as career education, to convey their experiences and concepts to their colleagues in and outside of the classroom.

The situation at the postsecondary level is rather less clear. As noted previously, there are a variety of disincentives that tend to retard the involvement of teaching faculty in activities such as career education. On the other hand, those persons on the campus with the greatest likely interest in this field, and indeed often the most knowledge and experience, tend to be outside of the academic, discipline-oriented hierarchy. Student support services personnel are often regarded as beyond the central decision-making process. They are unable to influence academic decisions with anything approaching the power of the teaching and research faculty, nor would their advice ordinarily even be sought on matters of curriculum design or program development. To say that such support services personnel are regarded as second class citizens of the academic community may appear harsh, but it is a view shared by many administrators, teaching faculty and indeed those who are themselves in such student services positions.

It should be noted that there are persons involved in student counseling and guidance activities within academic units. Faculty, particularly junior faculty, are often assigned a number of students as advisees. Likewise, a faculty member on administrative appointment as an assistant dean or some such similar post may have responsibility for coordinating student advising and counseling within the collegiate unit. These faculty clearly have the ability to speak with authority equal to that of their colleagues. They have the opportunity to influence programming and curriculum decisions. They often have available to them support personnel to expand upon and enhance their ability to develop and deliver innovative career development activities. Whether they do so, however, depends upon their perception, and that of their colleagues, of the need for and appropriateness of those activities.

What are the implications of these distinctions upon the relative acceptance of career education at the elementary and secondary versus higher education levels? First, policy that can be made by administrative fiat in an elementary or secondary school requires an extensive collegial process in a college or university. Second, while a school can obtain teachers with special skills and interests in career education, that is far more difficult for a college or university, given the nature of the hiring and promotion process. Finally, student services personnel are generally an accepted part of

the academic team in elementary and secondary schools, a situation that is not the case in most colleges and universities.

As we proceed in this analysis, the impact of these differences will become apparent insofar as they affect and shape the ability of institutions to respond to both the concept and the practice of career education.

PART II

THE PERCEPTION AND PRACTICE OF CAREER EDUCATION
AT THE POSTSECONDARY LEVEL

Career education is a relatively new concept, and in terms of most college and university faculty, staff and administrators, it is a difficult one to clearly and concisely explicate. In this part the study focuses on the ways institutions and their personnel perceive career education, as a concept and as a set of component elements, and, independent of those perceptions, how they do or do not practice both the concept and the component parts.

CAREER EDUCATION: PERCEPTIONS

The adoption and implementation of a new concept within an organization is based upon both the specific characteristics of that concept and upon how that concept is perceived. The former are objective, consisting of certain definable elements. The latter, on the other hand, is subjective, dependent upon the thought processes, experiences and indeed prejudices of each individual who may be involved in the decision-making process. To a considerable degree, the determination whether or not to adopt and implement a new concept often depends far more upon these subjective factors than upon objective elements. Indeed, the incorporation of even the objective aspects of a concept requires their evaluation and the ascription of relative values, two inherently subjective operations.

Colleges and universities are unquestionably complex hierarchical organizations. They are therefore subject to the same difficulties in separating the perceptions of a concept from its objective elements. It is within this framework that the adoption and implementation of the career education concept must be examined, for, as will be shown, adverse perceptions may render moot the most intrinsically advantageous program.

In dealing with career education, two quite distinct levels of analysis are necessary. There is the concept of career education, a formally articulated statement that seeks

to define and describe a multi-faceted approach to a broadly defined set of issues. And there are the component elements of career education, specific activities that might be subsumed within the overall concept, but which may be viewed as operationally independent of it. A useful analysis of the perceptions of career education among institutions of higher education must differentiate between these two levels, for it is quite possible to accept the latter while maintaining a negative or even openly hostile attitude towards the former.

This study begins with an examination of how the various component elements which together comprise the career education concept are perceived on college and university campuses, not as components of a unitary concept but rather as individual activities.

A. The Components of Career Education

In the introduction to this study a set of discrete elements were set forth as defining the components of career education. For the convenience of the reader, these are:

- faculty and curriculum development
- career information, guidance and placement
- involvement of external constituencies
- opportunities for work-learning experiences

The first step in such a review concerns the perceived institutional locus of each element, for in any hierarchy perceived location within the structure is often determinative of many attributes of the activity.

The faculty development and curriculum development components are universally viewed as falling within the purview of the academic side of the institution. Indeed, to a substantial extent they are viewed as the prerogative of the department and the individual faculty member, rather than within the ambit of the overall institutional management structure. To the extent that external forces shape these elements, they generally derive from the specific discipline rather than across disciplinary lines on a collegiate or institutional basis.

Faculty development is itself viewed with considerable skepticism by many scholar/teachers. Indeed, several chief academic officers indicated that they felt it necessary to search for new terminology through which to express their interest in faculty development, since the use of that and similar terms tended by itself to assure significant faculty resistance. This belief that semantics were perhaps more important than the nature of the substantive activity was a frequent comment, coming not only from administrators but also from faculty and staff. Those who were already committed to an approach felt that they had to be extremely careful not to use the wrong terminology in expressing their views, independent of their substance. And those who were either neutral or opposed to career education often appeared more affected by the use of specific words than by the specifics of what was being discussed.

Testing this hypothesis, it was found that if the term "faculty development" was used to describe an element of career education, there tended to be at best a rather tepid response. On the other hand, if the substantive element was proposed in the context of "providing faculty with the skills necessary to incorporate career information and development into their teaching activities", there was often far less concern and even considerable interest. The distinction is an important one, for it points to the difference between an activity being perceived as valuable in its own right and one which is seen as necessary in support of some other effort to which a positive value is ascribed. Thus, faculty development as an abstract concept is not seen as a matter of particularly high priority by most faculty. On the other hand, the development of specific sets of skills to meet particular institutionally-generated or, even more persuasive, discipline-generated needs is perceived as a relatively positive and necessary activity. The point was made repeatedly that such activities would only be appealing to and useful for a certain subset of the faculty, and that it would be a serious mistake to attempt to impose a homogeneous skills development process upon the totality of the teaching and research faculty. This perception is grounded in the even stronger belief that faculty independence and freedom of action must remain protected.

This attitude may readily be distinguished from the situation at the elementary and secondary levels, where in-service training is an integral part of the work pattern, often with a specified period of time allotted to it. Indeed, continued in-service training is generally a component of the salary increment and promotional system for teachers in these systems.

One must not, however, confuse "faculty development" in the context of the development of new pedagogical skills from the activities that routinely occur as an integral part of a college faculty member's scholarly pursuits. It is assumed by one's peers that the competent scholar will not only maintain his or her currency in the discipline but indeed will contribute to the advancement of knowledge in that field through continued research and publications. The enhancement of pedagogical skills and the acquisition of new teaching techniques rarely fall within this category of endeavor. Certainly, they are not recognized within the rewards system in the same context as scholarly activity.

Compared to faculty development, the concept of curriculum development is readily acknowledged as a necessary and appropriate faculty function. There is no doubt that one of the roles of teaching faculty is to prepare and implement curriculum for particular courses that meet generally accepted disciplinary standards. It is further the proper role of the

collective faculty to prescribe the selection of courses which together constitute fulfillment of a major requirement. Curriculum development is perceived as a positive activity, albeit one that needs to be done rather than one that is desired. Despite the fact that a faculty member may reuse the same syllabus year after year, the peer expectation is that he or she will maintain its currency as circumstances warrant. To a considerable extent, that assumption remains unmonitored except in cases of flagrant abuse.

It is important to recognize the perceived significance of the concept of curriculum development as a faculty prerogative. Innovation in the design of a particular course, or indeed of an entire sequence of courses, derives from the interests of the individual faculty members and their collegial involvement with other members of their academic unit. A department head or dean may approve a skeletal course outline, and even sign off on a reading list, but these administrative reviews are generally pro forma; an academic administrator is treading on delicate ground indeed when he or she attempts to dictate or even influence the internal structure of a course.

Not only is curriculum development uniformly considered to be a faculty prerogative, but the quality of a particular curricular element or series is measured primarily against contemporary standards within the discipline. The faculty

member is generally far more concerned with the opinions of his or her peers, particularly those with eminence in the field, than with those of a campus administrator or indeed of the ostensible beneficiaries of his or her efforts, the students.

What is the import of this perception of curriculum development upon its incorporation of career education values and activities? First, it is clear that the vertical imposition of curriculum development values through the institutional hierarchy is difficult and often counter-productive. More promising would be to promote interest in career education as a component of curriculum development through the particular discipline. Second, curriculum development, like faculty development, tends to be reactive in nature: something must occur which makes it in the interest of the faculty member to modify the curriculum for his or her courses. Generally, this is in the form of new knowledge in the field, accessed by the instructor through the publication of new texts. Sometimes it is the result of the faculty member's own research or that of a colleague which is seen fit to incorporate into the course content. The key is that the faculty member must personally perceive the need to modify the way the course is presently being taught.

Is career education viewed as representing such a need? For the majority of teaching faculty in most disciplines,

the answer at present is probably no. To be sure, there are differences between faculty in the humanities, who may see no relevance whatsoever, and those in professional schools, where the norm may be to incorporate specific skills development in order to keep the curriculum abreast of the field. Indeed, the concept of imparting skills to the student that will be relevant in a particular field of endeavor is the basis for curriculum design in such fields as education, business, engineering, social work and the health sciences, among others. In that regard, career education may be viewed as rather far advanced at the post-secondary level.

But it is also clear that career education, as it relates to curriculum design, is seen as an issue for the individual department and perhaps college unit, but certainly not something in which the institution as a whole should be involved. Presumably, the theory goes, if the graduates of a specific major are ill-trained to enter and succeed in their field, feedback to the department or college will influence corrections in the curriculum. Often, however, this feedback loop fails to function, frequently because the faculty perceive that their curriculum is not intended to allow the graduate direct entry to the field, independent of student expectations. (Note for example the situation of the graduate with a B.A. in history or sociology who wants to work in the

field rather than continue his or her education.) The issue that is raised, if it is raised at all, is whether graduates with a particular major are finding work in that field. Longitudinal surveys of graduates rarely, for example, ask whether the field in which the graduate is working is a desirable one, but rather whether it is or is not the one for which he or she was "trained". Since the question is not whether graduates have received an adequate education for the broader "world of work", useful curriculum development feedback is sadly lacking. Faculty, perceiving no particular problem, are therefore under no pressure to reform or modify their courses.

This particular perception may indeed be changing. Graduates are becoming increasingly vociferous (and in some cases litigious) over their inability to translate their education into marketable skills.¹ And present and prospective students are hearing this concern, and considering it in their choice not only of a discipline but also of an institution. This attitude is beginning to be perceived in a few institutions, and particularly among individual departments and colleges, and, as will be discussed in the next section, some changes in approach are becoming evident.

What of career information, guidance and placement?

There are generally viewed as important campus functions, but functions whose locus is usually outside of the academic

infrastructure. The Career Center, Student Counseling Service and Placement Office (or similar such facilities) are commonly located in the student support area. They are perceived by faculty as relatively isolated from the instructional functions of the institution, college and department, and that view is shared to a surprising extent by the staffs of these units. However, while many faculty and academic administrators are content with this separation, staff members and administrators of such support units tend to view themselves and their operations as far more central to the purposes of the institution. They argue that the separation is an artificial one; that it is essential that student support services, particularly those related to career development, selection and entry, be articulated with the institution's academic program.

In addition to the student support services that deal with elements of career education in the counseling/placement/guidance arena, academic units typically have their own counselling personnel and may, particularly in professional schools, maintain their own career and placement assistance operations. These are perceived as closer to the academic mainstream, in part because they are often staffed by teaching faculty who are either doing such work on a part-of-load basis or as part of a relatively temporary period of service as an academic administrator.

To a substantial extent, however, these support services are viewed as peripheral to the main research and instructional purposes of the institution. They are not seen as generators of change nor are they looked to for innovation. Such units are expected to deliver their services directly to students with a minimum claim on institutional resources and an even lesser claim on the time of the faculty. In such a setting, it is understandable that the staffs of these units feel frustrated when they seek to encourage the faculty and academic administration to accept a new or innovative idea, such as the importance of career education as an integral component of institutional policy.

The interaction of members of the business-industry-labor-governmental communities with faculty and students is in some respects the least highly developed of the component elements of career education, and therefore subject to the most amorphous perceptions. Adjunct, clinical and visiting faculty have been used by a wide variety of academic units and institutions virtually since the inception of the modern university. Within limits, this involvement of non-campus persons for certain instructional tasks is perceived as a valid exercise. But such use is viewed as clearly adjunctive to the efforts of the regular faculty, and again is most highly concentrated in the technical and professional disciplines.

The argument that effective career education requires more involvement in the teaching process by people from the "real world" frequently generates strongly negative response among many faculty members and administrators. First, there is the implication that such "outsiders" are necessary because the faculty cannot do the necessary instructional job, a contention most academics find difficult to accept. Second, the demand for more non-campus people implies that the faculty lack familiarity with real world situations, particularly insofar as earning a living on the outside is concerned. Since many faculty are themselves involved in consulting and similar such activities beyond the confines of the campus, often with the same firms and organizations that are called upon to send their personnel onto the campus, there is the perception that such an effort is at best redundant and perhaps advocated for other than academic purposes. Finally, academics, even those intimately involved in career education and experiential activities, tend to evidence an exceptionally strong protectionist attitude towards others taking on the responsibilities of "teaching". It is perhaps appropriate for a businessman or industrial manager to be a field supervisor for a work-learning placement, or to lecture at a session of a course on some specific area of expertise. But teach? That is viewed as a process best left to the trained, experienced academic faculty.



(There is of course a certain irony in this perception, since in order to become a college professor one need not, and indeed usually does not, have any formal pedagogical training. Nonetheless, the view is strong that non-faculty persons ought to have a very limited role in the academic process.)

The final element of career education concerns direct student involvement in the world of work. One of the first problems one faces in analyzing perceptions in this area is that there are so many different programs and activities, going under a plethora of names and descriptors. A conversation about work-learning may proceed for some time before the discussant realizes that internships are intended to be subsumed under the same heading. This is not a problem unique to faculty members; even the publications of the Office of Career Education tend to distinguish work experience programs on the basis of titles (such as internships versus work-study) where the actual meanings vary substantially not only from institution to institution but also between departments within the same institution.²

The perceptions of work experience vary significantly depending upon the terminology that is being used. "Internships" for example, are viewed by some as academic exercises, while "work-study" may not be. Clearly, there is need for a set of agreed-upon definitions that would enable persons to communicate

effectively about the myriad forms of work-learning programs.

For the purpose of this study, work-learning, as a generic term, has been given a broad interpretation. Specifically, the term is here defined as encompassing post-matriculation, off-campus experiential education activities that involve both a real work situation and an explicit relationship to the student's academic and/or career interests. There must be direct or indirect involvement with the academic program of the institution, rather than activities which are entirely incidental to the student's educational program. Not included in this definition is work experience acquired prior to matriculation.

Work-learning serves several basic purposes. It provides the student with an opportunity to test academic theory against real world conditions (sometimes referred to as the "academic component"); it offers the chance to experience the elements of a career option before such a choice becomes relatively irrevocable (the "career exploration" component); it provides the receiving agency, organization or business with valuable services and the opportunity to attract capable new personnel; it provides the student with a sense of achievement and self-worth; and it may offer a source of support for the student with economic need. The relative values ascribed to these components depend in large measure upon the perspective of the individual involved in the analysis.

The faculty member whose students are engaged in a work-learning activity as part of a course tends to view the effort as primarily academic. The extent to which the activity is also considered career development-related depends in large measure upon the faculty member's own conception of the proper role and place of career development within the institution. If he or she believes that there is a substantive responsibility on the part of the institution to equip students as best as possible to achieve their career goals upon graduation, then the perception of the work-learning activity tends to incorporate a significant career education element. If, however, the faculty member sees career development as something with which the institution ought not be involved, or perhaps involved only through its supportive (non-academic) services, then the tendency is to view the work-learning activity as purely instructional. Indeed, there may even be an attempt to avoid the appearance of a career relationship, perhaps through the device of placing the student in a setting clearly different from that which he or she might choose as a permanent place of employment.

Not all work-learning programs are administered by teaching faculty within the setting of a particular course. Many such activities are offered on college campuses under the auspices of separate work-study, internship or experiential education offices. These may or may not be a part of the

academic side of the institution (or they may be hybrids, as will be discussed later). Their common characteristic, however, is that they tend to perceive the work-learning activity as considerably more career development related, with the academic component often seen as a desirable but clearly secondary element. Administrators of these programs view their role as providing the student with an opportunity to test his or her career interests and conceptions against the reality of the particular field. While the student is usually encouraged to develop a connection with one or more academic courses, it is not uncommon for such development to be left to the ingenuity of the student, rather than included as part of the packaged program. It should be noted that students tend to perceive such an approach as evidence of a lack of confidence on the part of the program administrators of the academic value of the work-learning experience.

The reasons for this divergence of opinion as to the primary purpose of work-learning activities may be found in the relationships of the project sponsors to the institution. The faculty member finds that he or she must justify the work-learning involvement of the student on the basis of academic relevance and legitimacy. Arguing that the activity helps the student make an informed career decision, or that it teaches positive work habits, would be viewed only as

relatively useful side-effects of the direct academic implications of the effort. If these elements were to be presented to a traditional faculty as the primary rationales for the activity, it is likely that they would not be viewed as academically appropriate.

The non-teaching personnel who direct work-learning programs of course come to the situation from a very different perspective. Because they may be substantially excluded from the academic process, they are more likely to see the work-learning activity as multi-faceted. But because they are not able to append a specific course, the key facets tend to be career and service rather than course oriented. However, it is also clear that such persons are generally quite willing to perceive of the activity as having the potential for serving equally well both career development and academic needs. It is the academics, they complain, who fail to recognize the symbiosis which ought to occur.

Some do, however, perceive their roles as that of brokers, affirmatively working with the students and the faculty to develop the appropriate academic linkages, while working with the students and the receiving organizations, businesses or agencies to determine the placement that would best serve the student's career development needs. As will be discussed in the following section, it is these perceptions that tend to be found behind the most effective programs.

Generally, work-learning is viewed as having a certain degree of academic respectability, whether or not the particular activity is directly related to a course offering. To be sure, there are faculty who dislike such deviations from what they view as the traditions of academia, but at most institutions there now appears to be a sufficient cohort of persons, among both the teaching faculty and the administration, interested in developing and operating work-learning activities that such opposition is relatively quiescent.

Perhaps most important, in terms of the viability of work-learning and the implementation of this component as an aspect of career education, there is at most institutions a relatively substantial number of students who desire work-learning opportunities for academic and career development purposes. Thus there exists at most colleges and universities the combination of internal demand for the service and the critical mass of faculty and others available to deliver it (if often only in a minimal form).

It is important to observe that alone among the five component elements of career education only work-learning is perceived by the institution as generally arising out of internally generated demand and implementable through existing faculty and staff, often as a component of the traditional academic program. Work-learning is thus unique in that instead of being viewed as derived from the concept of career education it is perceived as valuable in its own right. Thus, it has

the advantage of an institutional base not usually afforded the other elements. The ways in which this base may be utilized to support the overall career education concept will be discussed in a later section.

B. The Concept of Career Education

This chapter has so far dealt with perception of the component elements that together comprise a system of career education, rather than with the concept of career education as it has been defined, articulated and promoted. As noted previously, although none of the component elements have achieved universal acceptance in the context of delivering comprehensive career education services, some have a considerable history of adoption and experimentation, and all have achieved some degree of penetration. But the acceptance and adoption of these elements is substantially greater than the acceptance of the formal concept itself as a component of institutional purpose and mission. Indeed, it is apparent that whereas faculty and administrators at an institution may favor the utilization of some or all of the elements of career education, there is a far smaller likelihood that they will embrace the concept itself.

Why this distinction? Why is a concept, which ought to be perceived as the sum of its component elements, viewed so differently from those elements? Is there something in the formally articulated concept that is not seen in its component

elements and that is viewed as antithetical to the aims of contemporary American higher education? If, as Hoyt argues, adoption of the coherent concept is necessary to truly achieve career education at the postsecondary level,³ then one must look very closely indeed at these negative perceptions, not only to identify their root causes but more importantly to determine what may be done to resolve them.

It is not without considerable irony that the primary reason the career education concept is viewed with such concern within higher education is the fact that few faculty and administrators understand it. Even among those who claim familiarity with the concept, there is enormous divergence of opinion as to what it really subsumes and what its implications are for the institution.

This is not to say that heroic efforts have not been made to generate volumes of statements, monographs and articles dealing with the career education concept. But this mountain of rhetoric has itself suffered from several basic problems that have further exacerbated these negative perceptions.

First, much of the writing on career education has been couched in terms appropriate to elementary and secondary institutions. But, as noted previously, the very context of higher education is substantially different from its lower grades counterparts, including the interpretations

placed upon many terms and concepts. Thus, postsecondary faculty and administrators reading documents aimed (intentionally or otherwise) at an elementary and secondary audience tend to obtain an unclear and often distorted image of the concept itself. The enormous differences in institutional purpose, personnel roles and governance make the transformation from one level to another difficult; the reader sees only a concept that appears alien in context as well as in content.

The current literature and the official and quasi-official statements of career education advocates have done little to alter this perception. Indeed, instead of presenting career education as a package that brings together a set of activities which the institutions have long considered reasonable and appropriate (although perhaps not related to each other), the concept has been heralded as a major reform, as a new force that will significantly alter the face of American higher education and its institutions.⁴

Such an approach has proven itself sufficient to cause many academics to prepare to defend their embattled campuses against yet another enemy. The nature of the concept becomes irrelevant; indeed, the content of what is advocated becomes subordinate to the perception that some outside force is trying to dictate how their institutions ought to be run. When faculty and administrators are faced with language that implies

that those who do not embrace career education will be left behind as a great movement sweeps the nation, their reaction tends to be either one of amusement or anger. Rarely, however, is it welcoming to the new idea. Faculty have been told through some of the career education writings to either get on the boat or have it set sail without them. They answer that higher education is their boat, and that it goes (or does not go) as they direct! The argument that career education is necessary to keep higher education afloat is similarly received with a mixture of skepticism and scorn. To a substantial number of faculty, the notion of their institution ceasing to exist seems no greater an evil than turning it over to those whom they view as having no understanding of the true academic process.

Second, the authors of much of the career education materials have either been directly involved in education at the elementary and secondary levels or engaged in the training of elementary and secondary personnel. There appears to have been little recognition that among college and university faculty and administrators the strongest conforming forces derive from each person's own academic discipline. Career education has been approached as a generalized concept of education, rather than being perceived as a development of disciplinary training.

There is also the problem of the intensity with which the concept has been articulated. Career education is promoted as the reform movement in American education at all levels. Massive public support is cited to defend the argument that colleges and universities have no choice but to accept this concept.⁵ Perhaps at the elementary and secondary levels such an approach is effective. But among higher education faculty and administrators, the very shrillness of the rhetoric has the effect of stiffening resistance to the concept. Many faculty consider themselves and their institutions to be guardians of the concept of learning as they know it. A larger number who may acknowledge the practical necessities of higher education nonetheless are loathe to address this issue for fear of being labelled vocationalists or worse. Thus, when one advocates career education as the concept, a certain coterie of faculty leap to the barricades, with the rest scurrying to safety to avoid being tarred by what is perceived as a foreign and perhaps dangerous idea.

Several senior administrators noted that there are some faculty who would rather see their institutions decline and disappear rather than give in to what they view as the forces of expediency. The "selling" of career education has afforded them ammunition in their effort to keep such a concept out of their own institutions. The argument that the public so strongly endorses the idea is only taken as further

evidence that this is an attempt to dilute the serious purposes of higher education through the introduction of activities with mass appeal but no substance. The fact that some of the survey questions cited in support of the public demand for career education have been phrased in such a way that a positive response is inevitable has further exacerbated this problem.⁶

There are also the considerable inconsistencies in theory and form that accompany the various presentations of the career education concept. The extremes are significant, for on the one hand the concept is presented as representing a specific set of events and activities upon which an institution should embark to achieve certain educational goals, while on the other it is set forth as an entirely new theory of the manner and purpose of learning.⁷ The faculty member who is disposed to accept the former may be far more reluctant to acknowledge the latter. One senior academic administrator noted that if accepting career education as a proper institutional purpose meant acceptance of the broad theoretical arguments that often accompany it, then many faculty and administrators seemed prepared to forego the benefits inherent in its implementation, rather than be accused of uprooting the traditions of the institution.

The lack of definition and agreement on terms among career education advocates is likewise a serious impediment to faculty and administration acceptance of the concept. Career education means so many different things to so many different people that agreement on purpose and method of achievement is difficult, even among those committed to the idea. When the term "career education" is used, the response is often either one of puzzlement as to its meaning or, perhaps more serious, an assumption that the term means something quite different. Often, the assumed meaning is far narrower and more vocationally oriented than most proponents of the concept would accept. Thus, it was not uncommon for a faculty member or administrator to respond to a question regarding the career education concept with a response clearly indicative of the belief that what is really being discussed in either vocational education or something very narrow like career counseling. Most people in higher education simply do not understand the career education concept, and many of those who believe that they do hold a variety of conceptions that often bear little resemblance to its true meaning.

Finally, there is the perception of the role of the federal government in promoting career education. Here it is essential that one recognize the derivation of the career education concept as rooted in and initially advocated through elementary and secondary education. There is a considerable

history of government involvement in the development and implementation of programming at the K-12 level. Curricula are established by government authority, qualifications for faculty and administrators are similarly established, and funding is provided for a wide range of general and specialized services. The initiation of a new government-sponsored thrust was therefore not perceived as anything substantially out of the ordinary by school teachers, their supervisors or their boards. The government -- and increasingly the federal government -- has long been esconced well inside the school house doors.

At the postsecondary level, however, the role of the federal government in the internal affairs of colleges and universities has not been so readily accepted. Of course most institutions receive large amounts of federal support for a wide variety of purposes, ranging from student assistance to construction grants to research support. But government intervention has generally been perceived to be in the form of resource assistance, rather than actually directing institutional activities. To be sure, the availability of funds has often shaped institutional purposes and priorities, far more than many independent-minded academics wish to believe, but nonetheless there has always been the conceptual difference between offering resources and establishing educational systems. Career education is viewed as falling into the latter category.

The intensity with which the career education concept has been promoted by the Office of Education has taken many faculty and administrators by surprise. They are uneasy with Washington pushing so hard on a pedagogical concept, nor are they comfortable with what they view as an obvious effort to rally public support to a government position that the institution and its faculty have not yet seen fit to endorse. The reaction in many quarters to the efforts of the federal government to accelerate adoption of the career education concept at the postsecondary level has been a stiffening of resistance to it.

The manner by which institutions are responding to government pressures to adopt and implement career education as a basic component of institutional purpose cannot be examined in a vacuum. One cannot lose sight of the fact that many institutions (perhaps most) are either now going through, just recovering from or anticipating the trauma of having the Department of Health, Education and Welfare examine in minute detail academic personnel policies under the aegis of Affirmative Action/Equal Employment Opportunity legislation, regulations and guidelines. Many faculty and administrators, regardless of how committed they may be to equality of opportunity, view this federal involvement as posing a serious threat to the integrity of their institutions and the continuation of their concept of academic freedom.

It is any wonder then that the efforts of the Office of Career Education to intensively promote the career education concept have been met with such concern and indeed apprehension among college and university faculty and administrators? Indeed, the findings indicate that to a considerable degree the efforts of the government to so visibly and strenuously advocate the career education concept have been counter-productive in terms of achieving its acceptance and implementation. Perceived as being imposed by forces external to the institutions, the career education concept is seen as posing a substantial threat. As will be discussed in the next section, that threat is contained not in the practice of career education but in its articulation.

CAREER EDUCATION: PRACTICES

The previous section discussed the way career education, in terms of its programmatic elements and as a coherent concept, is perceived at the postsecondary level. This section will in turn examine the degree to which these component elements and concepts are in fact becoming a part of the general thrust of American higher education.

We begin this analysis of institutional practices in terms of the adoption and implementation of the concept of career education. Perhaps it would be adequate to simply observe that no institution of higher education has achieved the status of completely embracing the career education concept. That is indeed the view currently taken by the Office of Career Education,¹ and in the context of the most expansive configuration of that concept, such a position is likely correct. (A study of exemplary programs contemporaneously commissioned by the National Advisory Council on Career Education should shed further light on this situation.)

It is certainly true that among the bulk of postsecondary institutions, the adoption and implementation of the entirety of the career education concept has not occurred. It would be atypical in the extreme for the faculty and administration of a college or university to agree (or even posit) that their institution is fully practicing the career education concept,

as it is described by the Office of Career Education. This distinction is important, because it is apparent that there are many institutions that do consider themselves actively involved in career education. But they reach this point through an examination of the sum of the activities they have initiated, concluding that their aggregate programs do in fact support a realistic career education effort. Of course, they may use many different rationales to define that which they are doing, and they may even refuse to accept the term "career education" as appropriate or descriptive. But if one looks at the career education concept as the sum of its component elements, there are certainly cases where a substantial proportion of the pieces are either in place or are developing towards such a goal. One may therefore accept the premise that the Office of Career Education version of the concept has not yet been achieved, while recognizing that in some instances the aggregation of career education elements could be viewed as adding up to a viable career education program.

With this in mind, it is appropriate to proceed to an examination of the status of those component elements as they are currently practiced. The set of elements described previously will provide the standard for this review. In summary, these are: 1) faculty development; 2) utilization of the labor-business-industry-governmental constituencies;

3) curriculum development; 4) career information, guidance and placement; and 5) work-learning.

The element that has achieved the least penetration vis-a-vis career education is undoubtedly faculty development, if for no other reason than that this area generally tends to be sadly neglected by most institutions. As noted previously, the term itself often has a rather negative connotation. Because faculty development is reactive, that is it is initiated only when there is a clear need to provide the faculty with a certain set of skills, its activation requires a suitable external stimulus. Career education is not ordinarily seen as sufficient to drive a faculty development effort, and it is uncommon in the extreme for an institution to engage in faculty development efforts aimed at the general career education concept (with the exception of some exemplary programs where special funding was granted for this specific purpose).

If faculty development is externally initiated, are there any elements of career education that can act to stimulate its implementation? The consensus is that the only component that does appear to achieve this characteristic is work-learning. This impression is particularly strong among students engaged in work-learning programs. They see the need for faculty to know more about both program design and the nature of the external constituencies. Involved faculty and

staff agreed that if their colleagues better understood the concepts and approaches of work-learning, they would be more supportive. Several administrators commented that faculty training programs built around work-learning activities could be used to instill an understanding of the broader concept of career education.

Interestingly, such faculty development efforts are often conducted outside of the faculty member's academic unit. A frequent forum for such activities (when they do occur) is a campus-wide work-learning center. When such a center is located either within the ambit of the academic arm of the institution, or with connections to both the academic and the support services areas, there is a fair likelihood that it will attempt to offer faculty the opportunity to learn about work-learning and through that about the rest of career education. However, most respondents indicated that the level of faculty response and utilization of such services was generally rather minimal.

The other forum where such faculty development on occasion takes place is at the meetings of the professional organizations. For example, the programs of the American Political Science Association and the American Society for Public Administration, to name just two, have for several years included sessions on work-learning, and have often incorporated discussions on counseling for the profession and the

development of career-oriented curricula. Since most academics tend to take their cues from their disciplinary colleagues, if they see their professional society taking an ambivalent stand on an issue, they are likely to do the same. On the other hand, if the organization presents the concept as an important factor in the field, then a great deal of resistance is eliminated. Unfortunately, many sessions are still devoted to debate over whether a faculty member should engage in career education-related activities, although the number that deal with operational and pedagogical issues appear to be steadily increasing.

Next in terms of institutional acceptance and implementation is interaction with the labor-business-industry-governmental communities. It is of course common for faculty to engage in consulting and similar activities for business, industry and governmental agencies. Through these efforts many faculty members obtain considerable insight into the current behavior, needs and priorities of such entities. Of course, this type of interaction tends to be concentrated within specific disciplines and colleges; thus, it is the norm in business schools (and particularly their management and marketing departments) for faculty to become intensively involved in these activities. Quite the opposite might be the case in a humanities division, especially in departments like classics or philosophy (although there are exceptions).

Exposure of faculty to the outside world (as that term would be defined by career education advocates) is therefore substantially a function of their academic discipline, as well as to a lesser extent their personal interest in and time commitment to non-instructional (and generally non-scholarly) activities. Obviously, the more one is familiar with the ultimate consumers of one's students, the prospective employers, the more one will probably incorporate their needs into one's teaching and counselling efforts. But this, it must be added, is a subjective relationship quite difficult to quantify.

Peer group pressure tends to play an important part in the decision of a faculty member to involve him or herself in work with an outside constituency. In some disciplines it is considered important for the faculty member to have achieved a degree of recognition as a consultant to business, labor, government and industry. In other fields, however, there is a feeling that such activities do not fall within the definition of scholarly efforts. In the latter case, at best these involvements are simply ignored when a faculty member is reviewed for promotion and tenure. In a significant number of cases, however, faculty members report (and this is concurred in by many administrators) that their outside non-academic activities are viewed negatively, as behavior not befitting a scholar or as indicative of a lack of scholarly commitment. When a faculty member, particularly

a junior one, receives the signal that his or her colleagues will conduct their personnel review in such a fashion, the level of outside involvement tends to drop precipitously. Even the inducement of compensation from the outside source is often insufficient to counteract the fear of being subsequently punished for such activities.

If the faculty tend to be wary of their own involvement with outside constituencies, what of the use of such non-campus persons within the academic system? The answer again varies substantially according to the academic field. For example, medical schools have always made extensive use of clinical faculty, practitioners who impart their working knowledge to the students. Indeed, a failure to draw upon physicians engaged in active practice would be viewed with some concern by the accrediting agencies. At the same time, medical students also become engaged in work in the field through their activities on the wards and in the clinics of the affiliated hospitals, often working alongside and under the tutelage of clinical faculty. The same is true, although to a lesser extent, in human services fields such as social work and education. But once one leave those areas where clinical education is a part of the norm, the involvement of non-faculty personnel tends to drop off. Participation in the academic process then generally tends to take two forms: Persons from outside constituencies may be invited to guest

lecture on a particular topic of expertise, or outside experts may be offered visiting or adjunct appointments to the faculty. Such efforts are most common in the fields where contact with the outside world is considered appropriate, such as business, engineering and architecture. It is less common in the social sciences and even less so in the humanities.

The concept of the full-time exchange of faculty and practitioners has often been advocated as a way to breach the wall between the campus and the outside world, and particularly as a way to increase campus career relevance. The basis of this approach is that people on both sides have skills and abilities that would be useful to the other. At the same time, the theory goes, the faculty member working in a business or governmental organization will learn about the latest developments in the field, while the practitioner assigned to the college campus will partake of the newest theories and concepts. On its face the idea seems an excellent way to develop the kind of academic-practitioner interaction that is demanded by the career education concept.

But many attempts at its execution have pointed up significant conceptual and operational difficulties. The most serious of these is the likely inequality of the services that personnel from each side can perform for the other. It is doubtful that the faculty member on assignment to a business organization for a relatively short period of

time can contribute significantly to the operations of the firm. Certainly the ability to substitute on a one-for-one basis for a regular employee is often impossible to accomplish. Likewise, the practitioner, even if he or she has the background and experience to successfully teach academic courses or seminars, may have difficulty convincing the faculty of that ability. The fact that there are clear exceptions to these rules does not diminish the premise that the typical case is less likely of success. Indeed, the ability of a few exceptional people to easily and effectively make the transition from one sphere to the other has encouraged institutions to experiment with such programs, only to find that it is these exceptional qualities that are essential for success.

Most institutions that have struggled with faculty-practitioner exchanges have found it necessary to move to a more flexible approach that would enable their faculty members to take a leave of absence to work in a "real world" setting, while making it somewhat easier for the qualified practitioner ("qualified", of course, from the academic perspective) to join the institution for a discrete period of time. Many institutions are becoming involved in these activities, although it is clear that they are far more willing to allow their own faculty to interact with external constituencies than they are to accept members of those constituencies as equals on the campus.

The general involvement of external constituencies with the life of the campus tends to vary considerably from institution to institution. Most colleges and universities, and many academic units within them, have advisory councils or committees whose members are drawn from these constituencies. Of course, the primary purpose of such bodies is to provide a vehicle for financial support for the institution. But in many cases they are also used as sounding boards for new curriculum and program ideas. Increasingly, agencies charged with approving new degree and curriculum offerings are asking institutions for market analysis to demonstrate demand; an active advisory council often provides a ready device for obtaining such an opinion. That such committees are often "captive" of the institution is really not relevant, since they do serve the function of obtaining constituency involvement in the academic decision-making process.

To a lesser extent some of these councils serve as watchdogs over the operations of the institution or unit, particularly insofar as their output -- graduates -- tends to meet or fall short of their expectations. This is an important career education function, for it provides a feedback mechanism that, properly tuned, would enable an institution to determine whether its programming is producing properly educated and trained students, at least from the perspective of potential employers. This function is not,

however, the norm among institutions, and again is substantially limited to those fields where institutional-constituency interactions are considered appropriate. Significantly, these efforts tend also to be discipline-oriented rather than dealing with the institution as a whole. Thus, the intent to make career education a generalized component of the entire higher education process is not adequately served by a council that is dealing with a relatively narrow subset of that institution's programming.

The involvement of non-campus personnel in the career information, counselling and placement functions of the campus has long been institutionalized in a number of respects. Career centers rely heavily on material generated by business, industry, government and labor to provide students with information and advice on opportunities, demands and requirements in various fields. Likewise, outside organizations and agencies send personnel to the campus to recruit students, and in the process provide additional first-hand information on career prospects and opportunities.

The involvement of these constituencies in the actual delivery of counseling, information and placement services from the perspective of the institution is rather more limited. It is true that there is a certain degree of career mobility between institutional career counseling personnel and comparable positions in business, industry and government. But it is more common for a career counselor to come through the

student services training process, with only tangential actual involvement in the "real" world. While a few institutions have arranged to have personnel from major local employers spend a certain amount of time each week or month dealing with career development interests, its adoption on a broad scale has been limited by both a lack of qualified and interested corporate personnel and by budgetary constraints faced by the campus and the business alike.

The involvement of non-campus personnel in faculty development is virtually nil, except in a few highly specialized cases. There appears to be very little interest on the part of the faculty to meet with representatives of business, labor, industry or government to discuss what they, as faculty members, ought to know and do to better prepare their students for careers in these fields. Sessions at professional society meetings that attempt to carry out this function tend to be sparsely attended, and then mostly by very junior faculty who either have not yet acclimated to the norms of their institution or who may themselves be looking for career alternatives. From the perspective of the campus, such interactions seem to occur only when a crisis is imminent, as when an oversight body (like a state coordinating agency) alleges that an academic unit is not preparing students adequately for the field, and threatens to enforce that assertion with sanctions of some sort.

The most extensive utilization of outside constituencies involves off-campus work-learning activities. Here, by necessity, managerial and supervisory personnel at the site to which students have been assigned must assume some responsibilities vis-a-vis the work-learning activity. At the very minimum, they must be able to supervise the students so that the requisite work product will be achieved (or so that the students do not do any harm to the workplace or themselves). The field supervisor is generally given considerable latitude in terms of the specifics of the work assignment, as long as it falls within the general parameters of the program. Particularly where the academic component of the work-learning effort is not fully developed, the work-product element becomes paramount: The student's learning experience, whether substantive in the field or in terms of his or her career awareness, then tends to depend almost entirely upon the character of the immediate supervision and the nature of the student's interactions with his or her supervisors. The role, therefore, of the external person in such a situation is of considerable importance.

There is, however, a substantial amount of reluctance to turn over to such outsiders those activities that are considered "teaching". Even among persons intimately engaged in work-learning and career education there is often the feeling that the outside supervisor is limited in what he or

she can usefully do with the intellectual development of the student. Specifically, the notion of enabling the student to integrate that which he or she is learning at the work site into the more general theories and practices of the field is generally considered beyond the competence of the non-faculty person. The distinction is made rather sharply, therefore, between field supervision on the one hand and academic instruction on the other.

The rationale for such an approach is fairly basic: The more traditional faculty adhere to the belief that only persons with "proper" training and credentials can teach. That sort of response would tend to be expected, but what of the innovative faculty, who presumably would be administering programs of this type? Yet they tend to take the same general position, for the reason that often they are fighting a battle within the institution to obtain and keep a sense of academic legitimacy for their activities. One way to accomplish this is to draw sharp distinctions between those things which the faculty can and must do and those things that can be delegated to non-campus personnel. If "academic" elements are clearly kept within the province of the institution, the charge that the work-learning effort waters down standards and controls may be countered. The fact that such a proposition may also weaken the program (if for no other reason than the shortage of qualified faculty to carry out such functions) appears secondary to the need to institutionalize the activity itself.

Among the several elements of career education, work-learning is the internal element most likely to contribute to direct interaction with external constituencies. Indeed, a successful work-learning program necessitates the creation and maintenance of such relationships.

The next general element to be examined is curriculum development, a process substantially dealt with within the academic department and, insofar as it relates to a single course, by the individual faculty member. The question then turns around what practices have developed among academic units and faculties to incorporate career education concerns in the development of appropriate curricula.

The point was repeatedly made, particularly by senior academic administrators, that very little is done to examine market forces in terms of curriculum demand, nor are there many coherent efforts aimed at determining what a curriculum should contain to enable the student to compete effectively within those markets. But the market forces argument raises a negative response among many faculty. "Don't impose market values on us," they exclaim. "We are the last bastions of freedom from the pressures of the marketplace!" While it is obvious that no institution can in fact escape from those pressures, faculty rejection of arguments that market factors should influence curriculum design is often the result of instinctive reaction against such ostensibly inappropriate stimulus.

It is in this regard that a new force in higher education comes into play: Consumerism. Students are increasingly aware that the mere fact of having a college diploma or even a graduate degree does not in and of itself guarantee employment in the field of one's choice (or even insure any employment). Many are therefore looking far more closely at what the curriculum provides in terms of skills that they will be able to use upon graduation to achieve their career goals, and are making institutional and course decisions on the basis of what they are able to determine.

A few students and graduates have taken this process a step further, going to court over their claim that their institution, having graduated them with a specified degree and major, had entered into an implied contract warranting that they were qualified for and therefore employable in a specific career area. The fact that these efforts have so far been unsuccessful does not mean that under just the right set of circumstances an adverse judgement could not emerge. If indeed that occurs, institutions will find themselves in the position of having to evaluate their course offerings, curricula and graduation requirements in the light of whether or not they make the student employable. This is obviously a monumental and rather hazardous task to undertake. In the alternative, a number of institutions have chosen a very different approach, categorically disclaiming responsibility for providing ready access to a career and a job.

College catalogues are increasingly filled with tables projecting career trends and reporting on the success and failure rates of recent graduates in obtaining jobs within and outside of their major fields. A distinguished graduate institution, in a letter admitting students to candidacy in its doctoral program in English, sets forth in no uncertain terms a disclaimer of any warranty of employability as a result of obtaining the Ph.D.:

"I (the department chairman) want to point out to you that the teaching jobs so plentiful a few years ago are now difficult or impossible to find. I do not know what the prospects will be a few years ahead but I have no reason to think they will be different. I say this not to discourage you from further study but to help you understand the sort of decision you are making. You may want the degree because you feel that the study has its own value for you. You may want the degree because you are willing to turn your knowledge and skills to work other than teaching. You may want it because you have enough self-confidence to feel that in teaching and scholarship, as in any profession, there is always a place for the very best. You may have other reasons perfectly satisfactory to yourself even though the certainty of a teaching job cannot now be one of them."

In a very real sense, the sharp increase in career awareness among students has generated a counter-reaction among some faculty and administrators. They argue that if students fail to see the inherent value of the educational process independent of its career implications, then it is the duty of the faculty to explain it to them, together with a clear and unambiguous disclaimer regarding any assumption that the curriculum will in fact assure the student of entry into his or her desired career.

In that respect the career awareness of the students may be counterproductive in terms of institutional response to the need for broadly based career education efforts. Avoiding career relevancy entirely does not seem to offer a viable solution.

The curriculum development effort is part of a production loop that includes the student's decision to choose a specific institution and major, the nature of that curriculum, the other activities with which the student is involved, the guidance, counseling and placement services he or she receives, and finally the net result of the job hunting process. There is just now a beginning realization that the nature of the academic program does in fact affect the "marketability" of the student, and that this is an appropriate place to make adjustments in response to articulated career development needs.

However, such analysis, if it is conducted at all, is generally carried out at the departmental level (or, less often, at the college level). It is rare indeed that institutional planning in the context of curriculum design and development will be undertaken to provide both career awareness and to be responsive to market demand. What is needed, but usually sadly lacking, is an institutional overview that will allow for the influencing of curriculum development at all levels of the institution.

Disciplinary curriculum development requires the confluence of several elements. First, the faculty must be aware of the current and projected status of the field. Second, the faculty must understand the career areas and levels that their students actually enter, as opposed to what they say they would like to see occur. Finally, the faculty must be aware of future market demand, so that the number of students accepted bears some resemblance to the nature of that demand. The problem is that few institutions, let alone academic units within them, conduct longitudinal studies of their graduates with sufficient detail to analyze their career choices and the factors that influenced them. Without such information, it is extremely difficult to design a curriculum around desired skills and outcomes.

The question of market demand and the ability of students to deal with it is indeed very complex. On the one hand, an institution and its faculty tend to believe that independent of market conditions the best candidates will always succeed. (Note the excerpt from the Ph.D. letter of acceptance.) They therefore find it difficult to accept the premise that their students will not be competitive. On the other hand, market projections are not infrequently wildly inaccurate and tend to be influenced by their own forecasts. These combine to make most faculty members reluctant to engage in serious career development efforts that are based on either present or future predicted market demand.

But the problem of curriculum development as part of a career education effort is not one that can be dealt with from within the academic department alone. It is an institutional problem, one that requires campus-wide planning and decision-making. Evidence of the need for institutional planning may be seen in the considerable decrease of some disciplines as major fields of study, while the number of students enrolled in courses in the same disciplines shows substantial increases. One chief academic officer observed that at his institution the number of majors in a certain field continued to show a steady decline, but a record number of students were signed up for courses in the department. The reason for this development, he indicated, was the increased awareness among students that a certain level of competency in the field had become a necessary skill for a widening variety of career areas. But he further noted that there was little recognition among the faculty that such decisions were career driven, and therefore should be reflected in major requirements. While the affected department would certainly be quick to notice such a trend and attempt to translate it into persuasive arguments for more resources and inclusion of its courses in appropriate curricula, other faculties would be likely to view the shift as a quirk, a short-term aberration that ought not merit any substantial redesign of curricula or the reallocation of resources.

The increase in the number of work-learning programs is also having an effect upon curriculum development efforts. These activities require special course designations as well as adjustments in such standards as contact hours and the like. Since many work-learning programs require the students to have achieved a certain set of competencies before being able to undertake the work requirements, they are also influencing the establishment of skills development courses at earlier points in the curriculum.

It should be noted that no mention has been made of curriculum development activities that have the specific purpose of instilling "career education" knowledge. It is clearly inherent in the career education concept that the curriculum itself should deal with the need for career awareness and the ability of the student to acquire necessary skills, rather than segmenting it into specially-designed career development activities. Thus, courses that are often included in many catalogues along the lines of "Finding a Job" or "The Interview Process" are really only relevant as portions of the career information and guidance process, rather than dealing with curriculum development.

In the final analysis, curriculum development as it relates to career education must be viewed as being driven by demands internal to the institution. Some courses achieve high enrollment levels and either have large student/teacher ratios or are taught in multiple sections; others

draw so few students that they are a drain on departmental resources. The students, in effect voting with their feet, ultimately determine the rich and the poor courses and departments (controlling, of course, for the skewing influence of required courses). If students are able to understand what skills they need to be successful in specific career areas, and what skills or abilities are imparted by given courses or curricula, then by their own decision-making process they should be able to have a significant influence on the curriculum development process and its incorporation of appropriate career education elements. As will be discussed below, the mechanisms are beginning to fall into place to give the students the information they need to make these decisions.

A final force that seems to be moving institutions further towards curriculum development efforts aimed at imparting career-related skills and attitudes concerns the overall higher education market. In a study published by the College Entrance Examination Board, Philip Kotler, a professor of marketing at Northwestern University, notes that historically, colleges and universities have distinguished themselves from other organizations through the assumption that their product, higher education, was not sold to make a profit, but rather was made available to those who were qualified, wanted it, and could afford it.²

"The concept that higher education has an assured market has dominated the thinking of educators for generations. As long as colleges operate in a seller's market, it is unthinkable that higher education has to be 'sold'. In a seller's market, suppliers face a high level of demand and can pick and choose among customers. The seller does not need to attend to the nuances of demand, competition, and customer satisfaction. The product in a seller's market is bought, not sold."
(Emphasis added)

But the seller's market seems to be evaporating, and, as Kotler sees it, a growing number of institutions are recognizing their similarities to business organizations rather than taking pride in their differences. One of those similarities is the emerging need to "sell" the institution, to affirmatively attract students to its doors. The attractiveness of the academic program, and especially its relevance to student career objectives, can prove to be a powerful selling point both in terms of attracting new students and in keeping the existing ones (and graduates) satisfied so that the traditional word-of-mouth reputation building (one hesitates to use the term advertising, although that is of course just what it is) of the institution is positive and supportive. Curriculum development, and particularly that part that relates to career awareness and opportunities, is being increasingly viewed as a necessary component of the institutional "sales portfolio".

Here again colleges and universities may be distinguished from elementary and secondary schools. Except for the relatively small number of private and sectarian elementary and

secondary schools, the decision factor regarding attendance is minimal. To be sure, some communities have special schools that stress specific careers or academic emphases. But most students attend the school that is designated for their geographic attendance area. The individual teacher and administrator rarely has to be concerned about recruitment of students. Either the enrollment area has enough students to support the school, or the district is adjusted, merging areas and perhaps closing a particular building. The teachers and supervisors usually are simply transferred to another school building, where essentially the same educational process continues. There is no great stake in the future of a particular school (although certainly parents and other residents may feel very strongly) insofar as the professional staff is concerned. Obviously, the situation is very different indeed at the postsecondary level, where cutthroat competition for students in some cases has already developed.

The next component to be examined is the bundle of services subsumed under career information, counseling, and placement. The first characteristic that one must note in examining these campus services is that they are often fragmented, not only between academic and support services units but also within those units. Thus, the student counseling service may deal with vocational aptitude testing and counseling, independent of the career placement center. Academic units, from the

department up to the campus academic affairs office, may provide greater or lesser amounts of counseling and guidance services as they relate to career options and choices, and may even operate their own information and placement services quite independent of any other campus facility. Where both academic and support services units are involved in the delivery of the same services, the academic-based services are usually more highly regarded within the institutional hierarchy (although not necessarily so by the consumers of those services, the students). The presence of career counseling activities in one academic department is not, however, predictive of the availability of comparable services in any other, nor is there any particular pattern based on discipline nor indeed upon the strength of a campus-wide service unit (although professional academic units are more likely to be so configured).

The campus career center is viewed as a service function, although several institutions have endeavored to so broaden the scope of services offered through the center that student (and faculty) interest would be more readily captured. Indeed, several of the most successful campus career centers make it a point to involve faculty in their operations, coopting the skills and knowledge that might otherwise be confined to a departmental effort (an effort that may well be very limited in both scope and availability).

Indeed, the question of the availability of knowledge about the career information, counseling and placement services available on a given campus seems to be one of the major problems identified by administrators, faculty, staff and students alike. The persons involved in delivering the services decry the apparent lack of interest among students in making use of what they have to offer. The students, on the other hand, are often unaware of the range of assistance they can receive, or how they can use it. It is important to note the effect of student impressions upon the effectiveness of a career services operation. Since the utilization of such an office is entirely voluntary (a characteristic that may be distinguished from the counseling section of an academic unit, which may require students to pass through, if only in a cursory manner, to get their programs approved), if students believe that the services are unnecessary or ineffective, they simply will not make use of them. To a certain degree, career information and placement officers must recognize the need to engage in campus marketing to convince their potential clientele of the value of their services.

The fact that these services are often scattered around the campus is further complicated in that many logical interactions do not ordinarily occur at all. As Hoyt aptly noted, a campus career center ought to integrate a series of functions that would support the student from the time he or she

expressed an interest in the institution through placement of that student either in an appropriate career position or into the next step of his or her higher education.³ In between, the integrated career center would provide advisement on the relationships between career goals and academic curricula, the alternatives to classroom learning experiences, and the opportunities for testing and evaluative services to guide the student in those choices. In theory, such an integrated system would serve as the heart of a career education operation; in reality, finding such a combination of services and resources under one roof would be very much an anomaly. The interrelationships inherent in these services have yet to be fully understood and acknowledged. Nor, indeed, is there yet firm evidence that the concept of strong linkages between academic and student support services as they relate to career education is well established. Career information, counseling and placement services remain for the most part isolated from the mainstream of institutional activities, and are often the support areas that feel the earliest impact of budget cuts and economy measures.

Even the best funded and well coordinated career information and counseling service, wherever located, faces another serious set of problems: whether the capacity exists to usefully guide the student in terms of career alternatives. To be sure, a certain portion of the career counseling process

deals with factors intrinsic to the student: his or her talents and interests, skills, strengths and weaknesses. But part of the process revolves around the ability to determine the state of the job market, not only at the present point in time but also several years in the future, when the current freshman may be graduating from professional school. The problem is that manpower and job market forecasts have tended to be rather volatile, in part due to the difficulties inherent in projecting present technologies, interests and demands into the future and, in part, because the determinations of future market demand tend to trigger self-accelerating decisions which oft times result in overreactions. These two elements have been described as the "Edsel Syndrome" and the "Snowball Effect".

The Edsel Syndrome refers to the need to determine a trend several years into the future on the basis of present information and perceptions. In the classic case of the Edsel automobile, at the time the design was formulated public preferences clearly pointed towards elaborate chrome trim, prominent fins and substantial weight. Some years later, however, when the first Edsels rolled off the assembly lines, public opinion and tastes had changed radically: The cars were actually obsolete before they were built.

The same effect occurs in manpower projections. What is deduced for the future must be based on current conditions

and projected events. That can be thrown wildly off target either by inadequate current information or the occurrence of an unanticipated event. Thus, when the Russians surprised the U.S. by launching Sputnik ahead of the first American space satellite, the "space race" was set in motion. That in turn precipitated an enormous increase of interest in and demand for scientists and engineers. But that was a current demand, to catch up with a present technological problem (real or perceived); the issue was not one of adding hordes of new workers five or eight years down the road.

But the public and the colleges and universities took that demand to heart, the latter encouraged mightily by an enormous infusion of federal dollars to support the training of scientists and engineers. Hence, the Snowball Effect: eight years later the supply of scientists and engineers in many fields considerably exceeded the demand. Now a reverse Snowball Effect took place, as high school seniors and their parents learned how hard it would be to find a job in those fields. As might be expected, a decade after the first turnaround a new shortage of professionals in these fields emerged.

The result of these factors is that both career counsellors and institutional administrators have become concerned over the question of whether they should attempt to guide students at all in terms of career decisions. Some have gone so far as to argue that such counseling should be limited to an

analysis of the student's own capacities and interests in terms of potential career alternatives, without regard to job market conditions. Others urge that students need to have a clear understanding of those conditions so that they can make reasoned judgements based upon a combination of solid data and their own interpretations of their competitive abilities. A variety of approaches are being explored, including increasing significantly the amount of information made available to the student regarding the applicability of specific courses and curricula to various career alternatives.⁴ For the institution committed to career education, or seeking to develop such an effort, these issues pose serious and basic questions.

Finally, one of the functions campus career centers have begun to assume in earnest is the administration of institution-wide work-learning programs. Often, these activities have been developed in consort with an academic unit, resulting in the forging of a closer relationship between the career center and the academic side of the institution. This development begins to change the model of the career center becoming involved with the student only at the tail end of his or her academic career. Through the development of work-learning programs the career center engages the student at a much earlier point, allowing the resources of the center to serve the students in a more

flexible and creative way. This involvement, for example, allows career center staff to draw upon their business, industry, government and community contacts in the development of the work-learning program, relieving the faculty of a very complex set of responsibilities. As will be noted in the following discussion, career centers engaged in campus-wide work-learning activities are tending to approach the model of the central career education facility advocated by the Office of Education.

Work-learning, whether under the name of internships, cooperative education, work-study, experiential education or any one of a dozen other terms, has long been a feature of American higher education. Perhaps the most serious problem in analyzing the state of work-learning among colleges and universities revolves around this plethora of names and descriptors. As discussed in the previous section on perceptions, it is often difficult to determine in advance the terminology that is in current use at an institution to describe its work-learning programs. The use of the plural (programs) must also be recognized as a significant part of the problem, for it is commonly the case for all but the very smallest institutions to have several work-learning programs, often operating in splendid isolation from each other.⁵ In surveying the state of work-learning programs at an institution, one must recognize both the

semantic differences as well as the fact that often no one administrator or faculty member has reliable information on the extent of such activities.

In order to conduct any sort of coherent review of these programs, it is necessary that they be approached according to several basic characteristics. The first of these is the locus of the program within the institution. It is clear that the vast bulk of work-learning programs are carried out at the departmental level. Indeed, many such activities are operated by individual faculty members, usually with the sufferance of the department but often with little support. These ad hoc work-learning activities depend in large measure upon the interest and commitment of the faculty sponsor, tending to appear and disappear as personnel changes occur in the department. They infrequently lay claim to significant departmental resources; in most cases, supervision of a work-learning program is only given weight equivalent to teaching one course. That this relationship is generally completely out of line with the amount of time and effort necessary to administer a proper program does not seem to affect its extensive utilization.

The legitimacy of the individually-sponsored work-learning activity depends in large measure upon the ability of the faculty member to convince his or her colleagues of the academic validity of the enterprise. Usually all that the faculty

sponsor must demonstrate is that there is a suitable connection between the work-learning activity and the subject matter under the jurisdiction of the department. When academic credit is awarded for the experience, the further test (applied, to be sure, with little precision) is whether the "intellectual rigor" of the activity is in some way comparable to that required of a regular course.

It is important to recognize that the work-learning program administered by a single faculty member on a substantially ad hoc basis suffers from the need to maintain this image of academic legitimacy. In part this is so that the faculty member can protect his or her own career advancement. Thus it is not uncommon for the academic element of such work-learning activities to be emphasized far beyond any career development or service components, sometimes to the point of explicitly stating that the latter are not relevant considerations. The use of the ostensibly academic-sounding terms "internship" or "field study" is indicative of the desire to avoid a "work" connotation.

Work-learning programs that are administered at the departmental level differ only in degree from those that are sponsored by individual faculty members. In part this is because like the individually sponsored effort such departmental programs tend to be assigned to the most junior faculty, with the result that the same pressures for academic

legitimacy often emerge. Indeed, because the program has the imprimatur of the faculty of the department, and therefore may operate under somewhat closer scrutiny, there may even be a greater emphasis on the learning component and an avoidance of the work or career development aspects.

Some departmentally organized work-learning programs do have significant career development objectives. This is particularly so in the case of programs that go under the rubric of "cooperative education". While most co-op programs are administered at a college level, one begins to see this type of activity among certain departments, notably in the technology fields. Here the learning component is considered integral with the work product and the career development aspects, and indeed sometimes secondary to them. The purpose of the co-op style of work-learning effort is to expose students to different career alternatives and work styles, to enable them to make more rational career choices, and to provide them with a competitive advantage over others who have not had the same opportunity.

At the college level, one is more likely to find work-learning programs with career development objectives inherent in their design. But it is also true that many college-wide programs must struggle with the same questions of academic legitimacy that face their departmental brethren. Thus, a program administered for a college within a large university

is clearly described as a component of the student's academic experience, even to the point of making assignments to work areas outside of the student's direct career interests. The avowed intent is to provide the student with a different perspective on his or her chosen field, to allow the student to be a participant-observer rather than become so enmeshed in the career elements as to lose sight of the academic experience.

A problem inherent in college-level work-learning programs is that they tend to suffer from a certain degree of schizophrenia. Aside from the obvious need to balance work and learning (academic versus career development versus work product) there is also often the question of whether the unit administering the program is there as a service to the other academic departments or whether it is itself part of the academic instructional program. This is not merely a semantic question, for upon it may revolve the issue of the acceptance of work-learning, and with it important elements of career education, as they apply to the aggregate units of the college.

If the unit is viewed as overhead, serving the several departments within the college, then there is a certain implicit acceptance of the concept of work-learning as a college-wide endeavor. On the other hand, if the unit is viewed as standing alone, perhaps offering on its own one or two work-learning courses or projects, then it is

relatively easy for the rest of the faculty to relegate the unit to a corner of the college where, while it is available to the interested students, it certainly does not become an integral part of the baseline academic process. (Of course, it is somewhat seductive to have one's own catalogue listings and a degree of autonomy, and many programs seek such self-sufficient status for these reasons.)

The final configuration of work-learning programs is those that are operated on a campus-wide basis. Unlike the previous types which are inherently a part of an academic unit, these efforts are often administered quite separately from the academic side of the institution. Frequently they are established as public service ventures, designed to give students the opportunity to work with community groups and the like to learn about them while providing a valuable set of needed services. In most cases, such community service internships are distinct from campus academic programs, not infrequently administered through a campus ministry, student organization or campus outreach arm.

The academic involvement of these work-learning experiences, and their career development relatedness, tend to be secondary to the community service (work product) component. This is not to say that many of these programs do not have academic connections. But it is common for that element to be developed as an add-on to the service activity. Often,

for example, the student is encouraged to find a way to connect a course he or she is taking to the work-learning activity, so as to be able to acquire some academic credits as well as providing the service to the community. Likewise, many such community work-learning programs seek to place students in areas where they can test out their career alternatives and obtain practical experience as to the skills they will need to succeed in their chosen field.

Some campus-wide work-learning programs have been established either within the academic hierarchy or have bases in both the academic and support services camps. Several such programs are governed so that their administrators report jointly to both an academic officer and to a senior student services or support services administrator. Despite the obvious risk of managerial conflict, this combination is very highly regarded by those who have been able to accomplish such a structure, permitting as it does ready access to the personnel, services and resources (not to mention influence) of both the academic and support services sides of the institution.

The locus of the program is particularly important for campus-wide operations, since to a considerable extent that will determine the relative emphasis placed on its elements. For example, a program administered entirely through the student support services side may find difficulty in

arranging academic interactions for the students and may therefore lapse into the more convenient mode of stressing community service, on-the-job learning and career awareness attributes. On the other hand, a program completely esconced within an academic office may find itself compelled to emphasize the relationship between the internship activity and the academic program, to the exclusion of the other attributes.

Aside from organizational locus, another key element concerns the relative emphases placed upon the basic attributes of the work-learning activity. In part, this is determined by the institutional home of the program. But it is also a philosophical question with considerable implications for the utility of work-learning as an element of career education. Any work-learning program may contain all or some of the following ingredients:

- testing of academic theory against real world conditions (academic component);
- delivery of a work product valuable to the receiving agency, organization, community or business (work component);
- development of an understanding of the nature of work in general and of the requirements and attributes of the specific field and enterprise (career development component); and
- acquisition of financial resources (economic component).

It is submitted that a work-learning activity that is truly supportive of the career education concept must contain at least the first three elements. (The question of compensation is a rather distinct component that is finally beginning to be examined in its own right.⁶) Review of a variety of such programs indicates that the common pattern is for one element to achieve primacy, with the others included to the extent the program administrators are both aware of them and willing (or able) to provide for their incorporation into the activity.

As noted above, the emphasis upon the academic component is in large measure a function of the locus and control of the program. On the other hand, the degree to which the work product is considered significant varies according to the specific interests of the program administrator. Where there is concern over the delivery of specific services or the solution of particular problems, or when the success of the program depends upon the student proving valuable to the receiving organization, then it is likely that the work-learning activity will include a coherent statement of the work product requirement. But where the administrator sees the work-learning program substantially as an academic learning experience, the notion of any sort of work product may depend almost entirely upon the degree to which the receiving organization and the student agree to make use of each other's resources, independent of the involvement of the campus-based administrator.

The degree to which the career development component is emphasized sometimes bears an inverse relationship to the degree of academic involvement. A significant proportion of program administrators, particularly those with strong academic ties, tend to reject the career development argument as diluting the "learning" experience. They contend that students should be engaged in the work-learning activity for the sake of what they can learn from it, and not be distracted by vocational interests and concerns. On the other hand, work-learning programs that are administered centrally or from a career center (or comparable base) tend to place considerable emphasis on the career development component. In part, this is because they can afford to take a broader view of the attributes of the activity. But such an approach is also based upon the need to attract students to the program, and the recognition that an emphasis on career advantages can be a strong drawing card.

But even among those programs that are viewed as entirely academic, or where the discussant firmly rejects any view that the activity implies that he or she is involved in career education, attributes of that concept will be found in virtually all such efforts. Indeed, the presence of work-learning programs tend to be predictive of the development of, or at least the latent recognition of the need for, other of the key component elements of career education. Work-learning

thus appears alone among the career education-related components to provide an active catalyst for the concept as a whole.

An analysis of these interactions will demonstrate the inherent inevitability of this connection (with the caveat that many of those interviewed vehemently denied that any such connection existed, a commentary on the perception of career education among college and university personnel).

Obviously, off-campus work-learning programs must make use of external constituencies, whether in business, industry, government or community. Likewise, because students are placed in work-like situations, there is often the need to interact with labor organizations to obtain their support and approval. Management and supervisory personnel of the receiving organizations must be trained to deal with the students assigned to their work place. At one extreme this may be as minimal as explaining why the student is there; at the other, the external personnel may become clinical faculty to work with the students in the realization of their work-learning goals. Finally, members of these external constituencies must work with the faculty and staff of the institution to develop the work-learning placements, determine the types of students who should be placed in particular settings, and provide feedback regarding the operation and implications of the activity. Such interactions

based upon the work-learning program often develop into formal relationships between the institution and the external constituencies, frequently with the effect of broadening the nature of the interactions into additional fields of endeavor.

Like the involvement of external constituencies, faculty development and curriculum reform are similarly inextricably connected to the expansion of work-learning opportunities. In order to administer a program, or even make the determination whether students ought to be involved in it, the faculty member must begin to develop an understanding of the available options, the nature of the work-learning experience, the degree to which learning may occur in a non-classroom setting, the diplomacy of interactions with external constituencies, and the effects of such activities on the rest of the curriculum. Similarly, even in its simplest form, an academic work-learning program requires some sort of course description within which it can operate. Feedback from work-site supervisors may indicate that students require certain skills in order to be able to perform their assignments, resulting in further curriculum modifications. Likewise, students returning from their work-learning experiences will tend to be more knowledgeable of both what their career options may be and what courses they need to acquire the necessary skills to achieve them. This in turn results in market pressure within

the institution to modify the curriculum to meet those interests, not to mention the pressure placed upon the faculty to remain a step ahead of the students as they acquire knowledge of "real world" situations. Indeed, several discussants commented that effective work-learning programs tended to place considerable pressure on the faculty to update their own knowledge, although this result was not uniformly regarded as a positive attribute. Some faculty felt that students tended to become too willing to challenge basic theories and concepts on the basis of limited experience in a work setting.

Finally, work-learning programs depend in considerable measure on the availability of appropriate counseling and guidance services, related to the particular program. Often such a capability is developed within the unit administering the work-learning activity, involving that unit in a level of student support services that otherwise might be considered inappropriate. Where work-learning programs are centrally administered, the interaction with the campus career center is often strong, thereby developing a new set of links between academic and support services areas. An effective work-learning program relies as much on proper pre-placement counseling and guidance, and post-placement synthesis of the experience as it does on the quality of the internship experience itself.

The extent to which work-learning programs have penetrated even the most pedagogically conservative institutions is an important consideration in evaluating the significance of this element in any effort to promote career education at the postsecondary level. Unlike specially established career education centers that tend to be outside of the academic mainstream, work-learning programs are scattered throughout most institutions, often distributed at the departmental, college and campus levels. Development of work-learning programs as the precursor of a comprehensive career education effort seems most likely, among all the elements of the career education concept, to be successful under existing and reasonably anticipated institutional and societal conditions.

EXEMPLARY LIST OF FEDERAL PROGRAMS WITH THE POTENTIAL FOR
PROVIDING SUPPORT TO THE DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION OF
THE CAREER EDUCATION CONCEPT AT THE POSTSECONDARY LEVEL

I. WORK-LEARNING

A wide variety of federal programs are presently in place to support work-learning activities. These range from the massive College Work-Study Program, with funding approaching the half-billion level, to catalytic programs that can provide minimal but often essential start up funds. Most of these programs suffer from a common defect: they are seen as serving only one purpose, even though they may be eminently usable, without major change, to support the mix of functions embodied in the work-learning concept. Needed is guidance to encourage users of these programs to seek the combination of elements that can transform a purely community service or financial aid activity into a true work-learning experience. In most cases some modifications in guidelines or regulations may be necessary.

College Work-Study Program (CWSP)

Title IV-C, Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended
CFDA* # 13.463

Work-Study Job Location and Development Program

Title IV-C, Sec. 447, Higher Education Act of 1965,
as amended by Higher Education Amendments of 1976.
CFDA # (new)

Cooperative Education Program

Title VIII, Sec. 802, Higher Education Act of 1965,
as amended by Higher Education Amendments of 1976.
CFDA # 13.510

* "CFDA" refers to the Catalogue of Federal Domestic Assistance

University Year for Action

Title I-B, Domestic Volunteer Service Act of 1973.
CFDA # 72.004

National Student Volunteer Program

Title I-B, Sec. 114, Domestic Volunteer Service Act
of 1973.
CFDA # 72.005

Youth Challenge Program

Title I-B, Sec. 114, Domestic Volunteer Service Act
of 1973.
CFDA # 72.009

Vocational Education Cooperative Education

Title I-G, Vocational Education Amendments of 1968, and
Title II, Education Amendments of 1972.
CFDA # 13.495

Vocational Education Work-Study

Title I-H, Vocational Education Amendments of 1968, and
Title II, Education Amendments of 1972.
CFDA # 13.501

Youth Conservation Corps

Youth Conservation Corps Act of 1970
CFDA # 10.661

Comprehensive Employment and Training Programs (CETA)

Titles I & II, Comprehensive Employment and Training
Act of 1973.
CFDA # 17.232

Law Enforcement Assistance Internships

Sec. 406f, Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act
of 1968, as amended.
CFDA # 16.512

Law School Clinical Assistance Program

Sec. 1103, Higher Education Act of 1965.
CFDA # (none, unfunded)

In addition to the above exemplary list, many substantive
acts have included in them provisions that could be utilized
to support appropriate work-learning activities.

II. CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

A considerable number of programs exist to support curriculum development, redesign and evaluation efforts. In addition to the obvious inclusion of the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE) and the programs of the National Institute of Education (NIE), a sampling of programs would include the following:

Strengthening Developing Institutions

Title III, Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended
CFDA # 13.454

Employment and Training Research and Development

Title III, Comprehensive Employment and Training Act of 1973.
CFDA # 17.233

Women's Educational Equity

Sec. 408, Women's Educational Equity Act of 1974.
CFDA # 13.565

Science Education Improvement

National Science Foundation Act of 1950.
CFDA # 47.048

Public Service Professional Education

Title IX, Parts A & C, Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended.
CFDA # 13.555

Cooperative Education - Training and Research

Sec. 803, Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended by Higher Education Amendments of 1976.
CFDA # 13.510

Employment and Training Institutional Grants

Title III, Comprehensive Employment and Training Act of 1973.
CFDA # 17.219

Increasingly, most substantive acts include a provision for development of appropriate academic curricula in the specific field.

III. FACULTY DEVELOPMENT

Most of the curriculum development programs also provide for faculty development activities, consistent with career education interests. Some additional potential resources for this purpose would include the following:

Faculty Training in Energy

Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended.
CFDA # 24.007

Summer Seminars for College Teachers/Promotion of the Humanities

National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities
Act of 1965.
CFDA # 45.116

Law Enforcement Assistance Educational Development

Omnibus Crime Act of 1970.
CFDA # 16.511

College Teacher Graduate Fellowships

Higher Education Act of 1965
CFDA # 13.407

Environmental Education

Environmental Education Act
CFDA # 13.522

IV. Career Counseling, Guidance and Placement

Over the past several years a considerable number of new student services programs have been developed. Many of these are directed towards disadvantaged or other target group students. Frequently they are utilized on the college campus in complete isolation from other student services activities, and particularly from the general career development services. Following is a selection of student services resources that may be amenable to career education utilization:

Educational Opportunity Centers

Sec. 417A-B, Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended.
CFDA # 13.543

Talent Search

Title IV-A, Higher Education Act of 1965
CFDA # 13.488

Upward Bound

Title IV-A, Higher Education Act of 1965
CFDA # 13.492

Women's Educational Equity

Sec. 408, Women's Educational Equity Act of 1974.
CFDA # 13.565

Comprehensive Employment and Training Programs

Comprehensive Employment and Training Act
CFDA # 17.232

Veteran's Cost of Instruction Program

Higher Education Act of 1965
CFDA # 13.540

NOTES

Introduction and Scope of Study (pp. 1-10)

¹Commissioner's National Conference on Career Education, sponsored by the Office of Career Education, U.S. Office of Education, Houston, Texas, November 7-10, 1976.

²Hoyt, Kenneth B., Application of the Concept of Career Education to Higher Education, Government Printing Office, Washington: 1976. (hereafter cited as "Hoyt")

Career Education: Perceptions (pp. 37-64)

¹The most recent survey of the College Placement Council indicates an increasingly high degree of dissatisfaction among graduates regarding the level of skills training they received in college with respect to that needed to perform their jobs. CPC, October, 1976.

²Hoyt, pp. 10-11.

³Hoyt, pp. 6-7.

⁴See, for example, Hoyt, Kenneth B., Career Education and the Marshmallow Principle, unpublished remarks, presented to Georgia Personnel and Guidance Association, Macon, 1976.

⁵A number of opinion surveys and polls are cited in support of the premise that the public now demands the infusion of greater career-relatedness into all levels of education. Most recently this public pressure was cited in the remarks of Dr. Sidney Marland, President, College Entrance Examination Board, at the Commissioner's National Conference on Career Education, Houston, 1976.

⁶For example, the Office of Education's own review of its "Introduction to Career Education" included a series of statements with which selected audiences could agree or disagree. The following statement received unanimous agreement among three respondent groups:

"To many students fail to see meaningful relationships between what they are being asked to learn in school and what they will do when they leave the educational system"

It is difficult to see where any other answer is possible. Likewise, public opinion questions have focused on statements like:

"Should students learn more marketable skills while they are still in school?"

Again, a valid question, but impossible for most people to deny.

⁷see, for example, Hoyt, p.6; compare Hoyt, An Introduction to Career Education, DHEW, Washington: 1975, p 17.

Career Education: Practices (pp. 65-108)

¹Hoyt, p. 2

²Kotler, Philip, Role for Marketing in Higher Education, CEEB Review, October, 1976.

³Hoyt, pp. 9-10.

⁴see, for example, "Careers in Marketing", Graduate School of Management, Northwestern University, Evanston, 1976, for a combination of career information and extensive data on the characteristics of each course as they apply to particular career options.

⁵A survey conducted by the author for the Chicago Urban Corps in 1975 showed most institutions having multiple work-learning programs, with one public university reporting 23 separate programs.

⁶see, for example, Goldstein, Michael B., "Academic Internships: Can Cash and Credit Coexist?", Synergist, Vol. 5, No. 1, Spring, 1976.